

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

WHOLE No. 1153
VOL. XLVI, No. 4

October 31, 1931

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

| | PAGES |
|---|-------|
| CHRONICLE | 73-76 |
| EDITORIALS | |
| Mr. Shaw's Boobs—The President on Relief— Platitudes and Poison—"Equity" Turns a Page—Promoting Political Corruption—The Needy | 77-79 |
| TOPICS OF INTEREST | |
| M. Musy, Catholic Politician—Church and State in Spain—Modernity in Education—Can France and Germany Get Together? | 80-87 |
| EDUCATION | |
| Edison as an Educator | 87-89 |
| ECONOMICS | |
| Advertising to the Rescue | 89-90 |
| WITH SCRIP AND STAFF | 90-92 |
| POETRY | |
| Jeremy | 92 |
| DRAMATICS | |
| The Autumn Stage | 92-94 |
| REVIEWS | 94-96 |
| COMMUNICATIONS | 96 |

Chronicle

Home News.—The Interstate Commerce Commission, on October 20, after two months of deliberation, announced its decision on the appeal of the railroads for a flat fifteen-per-cent increase on freight rates. The demand for a flat increase

Railroad Decision was refused but the Commission offered the railroads a substitute plan by which it estimated that the total revenues would be increased by nearly \$125,000,000. This offer was based on permission to increase rates on certain definite commodities, a long list of which was supplied. Further, the condition was laid down that any increases of revenue accruing from the higher rates would be pooled and distributed "among the carriers who failed to earn their interest charges, in proportion to their deficiencies." This pooling of surplus profits was defended by the Commission on the ground that the ensuing rise in credit of the weaker roads is the only justification for increased rates in these times. The decision was received by an offer from the railroads to loan, not give, the money; while Professor W. Z. Ripley, the outstanding authority on railroad finances, hailed the decision as betokening "a distinct betterment of outlook for the future."

On October 18, Thomas A. Edison, inventor, died at

the age of eighty-four. His death was mourned as a national bereavement. The metropolitan press devoted

Death of Edison an extraordinary amount of space to his achievements and an attempt was made to bring everybody in the country to darken lights the day of his funeral. Pope Pius XI sent his personal condolences to Mrs. Edison. The funeral was conducted under the rites of the Methodist Episcopal Church and was attended by Mrs. Herbert Hoover, Henry Ford, and a large number of notables.

Bishop James Cannon, Jr., and Miss Ada L. Burroughs were indicted on October 16 by the District of Columbia Grand Jury. The indictment contained ten counts, and involved charges of conspiracy to violate wilfully the Federal Corrupt Practices act by failing to report all of the \$65,300 contributed to the Virginia Anti-Smith Committee in 1928 by a New York business man. It was expected that Bishop Cannon would seek to evade the indictment by claiming that presidential electors are State officers and as such not amenable to the Federal statute. Bishop Cannon attacked the U. S. Attorney, a Catholic, on the ground of his religion; but the indictment itself was asked for by Assistant U. S. Attorney Wilson, a Protestant, and said to be a "dry."

Bolivia.—On October 20 La Paz observed the three-hundred-and-eighty-third anniversary of its founding with civic and religious celebrations. A few days previously

Government Crisis a struggle, which had for its aim the overthrow of the Salamanca Government, failed with a vote of confidence in the Chamber of Deputies of 60 to 1. The Opposition composed of the Liberals and the Saavedra Republicans centered its fight on the failures of Finance Minister Luis Abelli. The demonstration, however, made the question one of confidence or censure concerning the entire Ministry. According to a *New York Times* dispatch, it was generally assumed by political leaders that because of the stringent financial and economic conditions chaos would have resulted on the overthrow of the Government, for if President Salamanca had been forced to resign, the Liberal party would have come into power under the leadership of President Tejada and the Opposition would have been formed by groups under former President Saavedra. The Saavedra adherents would have made a majority in Congress just as the Liberals and the Saavedra Republicans are in the majority now.

China.—After no fighting in Manchuria for several days, military activities were renewed in Manchuria on

October 21. However, the fighting was not severe. **Military and Civic Disturbances** Japanese troops were reported extending their zone of operations and seizing more towns in Manchuria. Autonomous movements, however, continued, though without making any significant advance. The international problems temporarily withdrew attention from the nation's civil disorders, but suffering from famine did not abate and depredations of bandit hordes increased, while student demonstrations both at Nanking and Canton had to be put down by force. On October 20, at the former place, a mob demonstration of more than 20,000 students, representing seventy-six schools and colleges was held and a student resolution made demands upon President Chiang Kai-shek, including the restoration of cordial diplomatic relations between Nanking and Soviet Russia, the immediate furnishings of arms and munitions to student volunteers, the hastening of political unification, the increasing of China's military preparations, the opposing of direct negotiations between Japan and China, and the restoration of the rights of mass movements to the general populace.

Czechoslovakia.—Dr. Eduard Benes, Czechoslovak Foreign Minister, recently outlined to the Austrian Minister at Prague a tentative plan for a customs union of Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, and eventually Jugoslavia. Such a project, it was asserted, would have the full approval of France. It would, however, raise some of the questions mooted by the proposed Austro-German customs union. On October 20, Dr. Benes expatiated on his proposals before the Foreign Committee of the Prague Parliament, insisting especially on what conditions economic cooperation between Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary could not be brought about. Nothing constructive, he maintained, could be done in Central European matters without unity between Germany, France, and Italy. Neither, on the other hand, could a Central European political or economic policy be framed or the Hapsburg question be settled without Czechoslovakia. He held to his opinion that the Little Entente would furnish a good basis for Central European cooperation and was certainly called upon in the present economic situation to maintain good relations with all its neighbors.

The Union of Catholic Charitable Societies and the Central Board of the Third Order of St. Francis formed a working alliance for increased charitable action this winter.

Catholic Affairs The organizations mailed out circulars of instruction to all the parishes in the country containing projects and practical plans for the formation of local groups of Catholic Action in the field of charities. To aid the unemployed at Dube, reconstruction of the Church of St. Mary, an ancient pilgrimage center, was started. It will be repaired by the State at a cost estimated at 150,000 kronen. The shrine was originally consecrated in 1861.

—The annual pilgrimage of Catholics to the relics of St. Wenceslaus in the Cathedral at Prague drew 6,000 of the Faithful despite inclement weather and the trade de-

pression. They marched through the streets with flags of the Catholic societies and the insignia of the universities, and the spacious Cathedral had not been so filled since the millenary observance of the Saint two years ago.

—The country suffered a great loss in the death of Msgr. Kolisek, a professor at the University. Engrossed in Slovakia and its problems long before the War, Msgr. Kolisek after the great conflict was elected to the National Assembly. He was the initiator of many movements in the interest of art and for the development of national intellectual life, and with his brothers, all six of them priests, organized many pilgrimages to Lourdes.

Ecuador.—An attempt by Provisional President Luis Larrea Alba to impose a dictatorship in Quito on October 15 just previous to the elections resulted in his forced resignation with his entire Cabinet, and former President Alfredo Baguerizo was entrusted with the reins

Presidential Changes of government. It will be recalled that Colonel Alba succeeded to the Presidency last August on the resignation of Dr. Isidro Ayora. The failure of the *coup* allowed elections to proceed peacefully on October 20. Incomplete returns indicated that Neptali Bonifaz, Independent, was elected. It was expected that Sr. Bonifaz would appoint a Coalition Cabinet. Before the elections Sr. Modeste Larrea Jijou was the Government favorite, but he apparently lost official support as a result of his connection with Colonel Alba's abortive attempt.

Germany.—Chancellor Bruening's new Cabinet was upheld by a vote of 295 to 270 in the first motion before the Reichstag.

Bruening Upheld by Reichstag The Opposition, composed of the National Socialists, Nationalists, Communists and other groups, offered a motion of no confidence in this second Bruening Cabinet. The Chancellor's support was led by the Centrists, to whom the Socialists, with 140 votes, and smaller groups were allied. After the preliminary vote, the Chancellor received a majority vote against calling for the dissolution of the Reichstag, and the revocation of legislation affecting the emergency program. The Reichstag then voted to adjourn until February 23 in order to allow the new Cabinet to develop the domestic reform without intervention from Parliament.

About the time that Chancellor Bruening's Cabinet was being upheld in the Reichstag, Herr Hitler's Nazis were holding a "field day" at Brunswick. Upwards of 30,000

Hitlerite Demonstration Hitlerites were reported as present. The leader stated that he represented 12,000,000 people "convinced that a solution of the German question can come only through the power of our united front." He declared that his party was alone capable of securing a reign of law and order in Germany. Fighting and some bloodshed accompanied the demonstration. General Wilhelm Groener, in charge of the army and the police force in the new Bruening Cabinet, promised that the most severe measures would be taken by the authorities against all acts of political terrorism and violence.

Great Britain.—Contrary to the predictions that the campaign before the general elections of October 27 would be the most "savage" in recent times, the three weeks of electioneering were comparatively dull.

Election Campaign Ended Political meetings were broken up by hostile audiences, but there was little enthusiasm otherwise. The issues developed into those of protection, Socialism, reduction in the salaries of Government employes, and restrictions in the dole. 1,286 candidates deposited the £150 bond; this was less by 500 than the number at the last election in 1929. Of these, the Conservatives presented 517 candidates, Laborites, 513, Liberals, 121, pro-tariff Liberals, 39. The number of electors tabulated was in excess of that of the preceding elections, namely, 28,342,854. In accordance with the National Government policy, three-cornered contests were avoided; straight elections were held in 409 constituencies, whereas in 1929 there were only 102.

Within the week before the election, there was a strong trend upward in an industrial revival. Large rush orders were received in the cotton mills of Lancashire, in the

Industrial Revival Manchester textile trade, and in the woolen and silk industries. Similar revivals were evident in the coal and iron output. The reasons alleged for the change for the better were the abandonment of the gold standard in September, and in the textile field, the boycotting of Japanese goods by the Chinese. As a result, unemployment decreased by 25,000 on October 12. The revival was explained in contradictory ways by the political parties.

Ireland.—On three successive days, the Public Safety Bill was rushed through the three readings in the Dail. In the second reading the vote was 86 to 66, and

Public Safety Bill in the third was 83 to 65. The Independents and Farmers united with the Government; Fianna Fail and the Labor

party were in opposition. As soon as the bill passed the Dail, it was sent to the Senate and was accepted, in the final reading, by a vote of 41 to 15. On the same day, it received the signature of Governor General MacNeill. It was put into effect immediately by the Executive Council, which requested the Governor General to appoint the members of the Military Tribunal who would administer the law. Five Free State officers were named: Col. Francis Dennett, Col. Daniel McKenna, Commandant Connor Whelan, Commandant Frederick Tuite, and Deputy Adjutant General John Joyce. Any three members constitute a Court, in which trial may be secret and the death penalty imposed; no appeal is allowed from the decision, though the Government may modify or rescind the sentence.

All the parties in the legislative assemblies admitted the prevalence of violence and the terrorizing and intimidation of officials. Eamon De Valera and his supporters,

Organizations Condemned however, protested against the extreme measures of the drastic Public Safety Bill, and against the use of closure. An outburst was occasioned by the statement of the Minister

for Justice, Fitzgerald Kenny, that the organizations condemned were in league with and inspired by Soviet Russia and were financed by Soviet money. A denial of this was published in the De Valera daily, the *Irish Press*; the denial was in the form of a manifesto issued by the Irish Republican Army, in which the rights of sovereignty of the Irish people were proclaimed. In a national broadcast, the Government named specifically twelve organizations condemned by the Public Safety Bill. Among these were Saor Eire, the Irish Republican Army, the I. R. A. Women's Branch, the Irish Labor Assembly, the Workers' Revolutionary party, the Women's Dissent League, etc. All activities of these bodies were declared to be seditious and liable to punishment.

In a Pastoral letter of the Irish Hierarchy, read in all the churches on October 18, the attitude of the Bishops in the present emergency was stated. The following extracts were taken from the wireless report to the *New York Times*:

Deeply conscious of our responsibility for the safety and morals of our people we cannot remain silent in the face of the growing evidence of a revolutionary campaign and a Communistic campaign which, if allowed to run its course, would mean the ruin of Ireland, body and soul.

You need not be told there is in active operation a society of a militant character whose avowed object is the overthrow of the State by force of arms, arrogating to itself the right to terrorize public officials and conscientious jurymen, to intimidate citizens into silence or acquiescence and even to take human life. Such measures and actions are in direct opposition to the law of God and come definitely under the condemnation of the Catholic Church; nor can bloodshed be made legitimate through motives of patriotism.

Alongside this society is a new organization entitled the Saor Eire (Free Ireland) which is frankly Communistic in aim.

It is our duty to tell the people plainly that these two organizations, separately or in alliance, are sinful and irreligious and no Catholic can lawfully be a member of them. The Bishops will direct the priests to exercise every effort to keep the young people from such societies and diligently instruct them on the menace of murder and the satanic tendency of Communism.

No retaliation, except meetings of protest, was made by the groups or movements condemned.

Mexico.—The political crisis was ended on October 21, when President Ortiz Rubio announced the formation of an entirely new Cabinet, headed by Manuel M.

New Cabinet Tellez, former Ambassador to the United States, in the post of Minister of the Interior (*Gobernacion*), with ex-President Calles as Minister of War. Aaron Saenz in the Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Labor, Genaro Estrada in the Ministry of Foreign Relations, and Luis Montes de Oca in the Ministry of Finance, were carried over from the former Cabinet. New members are Francisco S. Elias, a relative of Calles, in the Ministry of Agriculture, Gustavo P. Serrano in the Ministry of Communications, and Narciso Bassols in the Ministry of Education. Prominent names of those not reappointed were Generals Amaro, Almazan and Cárdenas, all of whom were supposed to cherish Presidential aspirations. The nature of the crisis which precipitated this change was not yet divulged but the rumor persisted that the President

would resign and would be succeeded by Senor Tellez, who would hold office until a new election could be held.

Spain.—On October 16, voting by acclamation the Cortes adopted the Constitutional article which gave the right of divorce by mutual consent. Characterizing the movement as "another indication of the Left to revolutionize Spanish life," the Constitution delegations representing the Catholic Basque and Navarrese districts deliberately absented themselves from the Assembly in protest. The article reads as follows: "Matrimony is founded upon an equality of right for both sexes and can be dissolved for just cause or by mutual consent." A motion to allow women to divorce their husbands without the necessity of stating the cause was proposed, but was defeated by a substantial majority. By this latest Constitutional article, it was pointed out, Spain joined Russia and Mexico in making divorce easily available.—On October 20, Manuel Azaña, newly chosen President of Spain, demanded and received from the Cortes extraordinary powers that made him a virtual dictator. Stating that the country was in possible danger from religious warfare, syndicalist activities, and other forms of illegal opposition, the President pushed through a statute which rendered unlawful the possession of firearms, public meetings without previous permission, strikes, unless announced eight days beforehand, the closing of factories without just cause, and the publication of newspaper articles calculated to disturb the peace. Only a few Deputies opposed the move to confer extraordinary powers on the President, but among these few Sr. Iglesias predicted that "this will develop into a masked dictatorship with Azaña and the Socialists dominating legislation."

League of Nations.—Over the strong opposition of Japan, the Council of the League of Nations, on October 16, by a vote of 13 to 1 invited the United States to join in deliberations on the Sino-Japanese Manchurian dispute. Japanese opposition was based exclusively on juridical grounds, since the United States is not a member of the League. The attitude, however, of the Council was that since the dispute concerned the execution not only of obligations resulting from the Covenant but also from those of Article II of the Pact of Paris, it was appropriate for the United States to be represented. Prentiss B. Gilbert, the American Consular representative at Geneva, took his seat with the Council on October 16, with the understanding that his role would be limited to participation in the discussions relative to application of the Kellogg-Briand anti-war treaty, being an observer and auditor on other points.

At the first sessions of the Council, in which neither the Chinese nor Japanese had representation, it was decided to invite the countries represented on the League Council

Peace Negotiations to send identical cablegrams to the Nanking and Tokyo Governments reminding them of their obligations under Article II of the Pact of Paris to settle their differences by pacific means. Only Great Britain, Norway, and

France sent such cablegrams. Subsequently suggestions were made by Geneva for a settlement of the dispute on terms which officials in Tokyo initially described as "quite unacceptable." These included the evacuation by Japan of the seized territory in Manchuria within three weeks. To this the Tokyo Government replied that if it ordered the troops withdrawn the Government would fall. Later it was announced that Japan had proposed agreement with China on the following grounds:

1. The two countries shall pledge themselves to commit no act of aggression against each other.
2. They will suppress hostile agitations, boycotts and hostile propaganda.
3. Japan will respect the territorial integrity of Manchuria.
4. China will protect Japanese residents in Manchuria.
5. China and Japan will make an agreement for cooperation and avoidance of ruinous competition between the South Manchuria and other railroads in Manchuria and give effect to all existing treaty rights.

It was further announced that Japan was ready to begin negotiations when these conditions were accepted in principle, and that evacuation of the occupied territory would follow as soon as conditions permitted. M. Briand approved the first four, but suggested substituting a simple clause for the fifth point to the effect that China should respect all her treaty commitments. Japan, it was stated, was willing to change her last demand but insisted that China should suppress boycotts and safeguard her treaty rights and her nationals. Later the Chinese submitted the following modifications in which they outlined their proposals as follows:

1. No negotiations until the Japanese troops are withdrawn.
2. A neutral investigation during and after the withdrawal.
3. Reparations for the damage committed.
4. Establishment of a permanent board of arbitration and conciliation between China and Japan.

On October 23 it was understood that League action would be postponed and that a resolution to adjourn and await events would be drafted, since, according to M. Briand's report, the two countries remained irreconcilable.

The visit to this country of Bertrand Russell, now Earl Russell, gives timeliness to G. C. Heseltine's paper next week on "Russell and Galileo." It will give us a taste of the scholarliness of this writer of popular "philosophy."

John Gibbons, in his wanderings through Lithuania, had another strange experience in a moving-picture theater. He will tell of it next week in an article called "The Fundamentalism of a Film Star."

It is only a short while ago that the American authorities took severe measures to put a stop to the selling of tickets to sweepstakes for Irish hospitals. Andrew E. Malone will tell about these "sweeps" next week in a paper called "'Sweeps' for Irish Hospitals."

Dr. Richard J. Purcell, of the Catholic University, will next week recall the life and death of one of the recently beatified English martyrs, in "An English Martyr of 1680." It will illuminate Catholic attitudes toward a tyrannous State.

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1931

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
GERARD B. DONNELLY
Associate Editors

WILLIAM J. LONERGAN
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Medallion 3-3082
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Mr. Shaw's "Boobs"

IN his address over the radio last week, the Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., of Georgetown University, scored a neat point when he said that in Shaw's opinion, people who take Shaw seriously are "boobs." The point was sharp as well as neat, but it was merited. The popularity of this shoddy jester is nothing less than a volume of evidence in proof of Barnum's famous contention.

In comparing Russia with the United States, Father Walsh enjoyed, it must be confessed, an advantage over Mr. Shaw that was almost unfair. Mr. Shaw has never visited these shores, but Father Walsh has lived here many years. Mr. Shaw's knowledge of Russia is limited to a trip of ten days, during which he was wined and dined by the authorities, and permitted to see only what they wished him to see. Father Walsh, on the contrary, can speak both from long personal experience in Russia, which enabled him to test facts uncensored and at first hand; and from careful research and investigation, since his residence in that country.

It was easy, then, for Father Walsh to demolish Mr. Shaw's picture of a happy and contented Russia, in which the freedom of the human spirit is glorified. Instead of liberty of speech in Russia, said Father Walsh, "there is the eternal threat of the O. G. P. U. and the haunting specter of espionage." Instead of freedom for the working man, "there have been drafted a set of decrees empowering public authorities to seize and transport workers thousands of miles away from their homes to regions of obligatory labor." Instead of inviolability of the citizen's person, home and possessions, "there have been thirteen years of terrorism, and wholesale executions, without trial, before summary tribunals." Instead of freedom of religion, "there has been initiated an obscene war on God, financed by the State itself, and designed to destroy the inalienable rights of conscience." When Father Walsh asserted that Shaw distorted the facts, and supported his case on demonstrable falsehoods, his criticism was, on the whole, somewhat too mild.

That Mr. Shaw will repeat his remarks on Russia is

quite certain, but he will do this only for a price. While Mr. Shaw loves to hear himself talk, there is one sound even more pleasing in his ears, and that is the clink of gold. Unfortunately for historical truth, thousands of his fellow-countrymen are willing to pay to hear him, and by capitalizing this weakness Mr. Shaw has provided very comfortably for his old age. But however gratifying to Mr. Shaw, the readiness with which the dicta of this mountebank, and others of his ilk, are accepted, is most disheartening to men whose reverence for the truth is genuine. What the public most regards today is not what is said truthfully but what is said smartly, and the most successful bidder for popular favor is the man with the cap and bells.

Well is it for the world that it always has some men who are willing to court popular censure by testifying to the truth. The crowd in the pit will not listen, but the effort is never lost. Truth will prevail in the end, but only when men rise up to fight for it, unmindful of loss of favor, or even of life. For truth, despite the optimists, makes no easy entrance into the human mind. Before the intellect can receive it, prejudice must be removed and ignorance dissipated. Unlike truth, error is not immortal, but it dies hard.

The President on Relief

THE speech of the President on the eve of the Yorktown celebration stressed the conviction, long entertained by him, that the local communities can take care of the unemployed. Mr. Hoover argues that in nearly every American city the relief organizations have made careful budgets, and he is sure that "the sum of these budgets will meet the needs of the nation as a whole." But he is well aware that these budgets will not be contributed, unless the people as a whole act on that "fundamental philosophy announced by Our Saviour nineteen centuries ago."

Many will disagree with the President's assumption that local charity can adequately meet all local demands. It is exceedingly doubtful whether that assumption can be verified even in the case of New York, among the most generous, and easily the wealthiest, of all American cities. In manufacturing and industrial centers, where a long period of unemployment has affected a majority of the population, it certainly cannot be maintained. The State of New York has appropriated \$20,000,000, to be expended on public works, a sum which, as Dr. John A. Ryan rightly notes, "is only a drop in the bucket," compared to a sea of destitution.

It seems to us that the crisis which the country faces will drain the resources of local private charity. Unless an improvement sets in, State aid will be necessary. Further, Congress should be ready to extend every assistance possible under the circumstances. Unfortunately, the political situation makes it highly improbable that Congress will do even what it can do and should do.

The President does well to remind us that we all have an obligation one to another, and that no nation can prosper unless it is respected. But it is not encouraging

to observe that in spite of the President's exhortations, corporations continue to slash wages and to close shops. This process makes the problem of relief all but insoluble, for while it increases the cases of distress, it diminishes the possibility of local contributions.

Platitudes and Poison

PRESENTING a mess of platitudes to the American College of Surgeons at the final session of their convention in New York last week, President Angell, of Yale, deftly seasoned the dish with poison. And this was a pity, for many of the platitudes were platitudes only in the sense that while everyone knows them, very few follow the wholesome advice which they offer.

Dr. Angell's address, according to the *New York Times*, was a frank discussion of the virtues and vices of the medical profession. On the one hand, the country is too little mindful of the immense service given free of charge by physicians and surgeons, Dr. Angell finds, and on the other, it is all too ready to censure the entire profession for the faults of the few, whose "ruthless charges make Shylock look like a pure philanthropist." It remained to be seen, said Dr. Angell, whether the shortcomings of the profession were to be remedied by State-controlled medicine, by industrial and health insurance, or by other devices; but many of his listeners must have felt that the President of Yale viewed with a too-indulgent eye certain "social movements affecting medicine."

What was most regrettable in the address, however, was Dr. Angell's approbation of contraception as a legitimate social device. Following lines that have long been familiar, Dr. Angell paid his tribute to the worth of eugenics in breeding out poor strains, thus diminishing "needless human misery." But as eugenics seemed to offer only an exceedingly slow method, Dr. Angell thought that a more suitable remedy might be found in contraceptive devices. "It is unthinkable that reasonable but drastic measures will not be found, to diminish the number of births of the seriously unfit, to say nothing of controlling birth, in excess of the possibilities of a well-conditioned population."

These remarks recall Mr. Alderman Cute, who was a full-sized, sleek, well-conditioned gentleman, and Mr. Filer, with his tables and statistics. The Alderman was quite sure that poverty and distress could never be Put Down so long as people like Meg and Richard insisted upon marrying, and Mr. Filer could prove the thesis by statistics. In fact, he had reduced it to a mathematical certainty. Like Scrooge, Dr. Angell seems to entertain no fear that he and his fellows will go wrong in ascertaining what that excess or surplus is which makes impossible "a well-conditioned population." Others are not so certain.

The spectacle of Dr. Angell, discoursing at a banquet in the magnificent ballroom of the new Waldorf Astoria on the surplus population was long ago foreseen by the wizard of Gadshill. His comment on it will be found in a little book which millions of his race will never forget, and so apposite is it, that it shall here be set side

by side with the unfortunate remarks of the president of Yale.

Man, if man you be in heart, not adamant, forbear that wicked cant until you have discovered What the surplus is, and Where it is. Will you decide what men shall live, what men shall die? It may be that in the sight of Heaven, you are more worthless and less fit to live than millions like this poor man's child. Oh God! to hear the Insect on the leaf pronouncing on the too-much life among his hungry brothers in the dust!

Dickens thought that the problem should be decided "in the sight of Heaven." Wise men agree with him.

"Equity" Turns a Page

IN a recent number of that sprightly journal, the *Billboard*, we are told of a "new plan already formed for stage self-censoring." The Actors' Equity Association has joined forces with the American Arbitration Association and the League of New York Theaters in working out a plan that is "swift and sure." These organizations "feel that they can absolutely guarantee the closing or modification of plays found to be objectionable."

No details of the plan are given. In fact, the Conference Board of the Theater has requested that all "details be kept under cover, feeling that secrecy at present will aid the working out of the procedure." One point of real importance is, however, announced. While Equity will not "hold the whip hand" in the working out of the new plan, it has agreed "to call out actors on the Board's recommendation." If this is true, Equity has at last accepted a principle which this Review recommended to it not many months ago, only to be rebuked for its pains.

Equity, it is said, has done not a little to protect the interests of the men and women on the stage. Adopting the methods of the trade union, it has been able to secure some, if not all, of the benefits of collective bargaining, and to this extent at least, it has compelled the financial groups which control the theater business to treat their employes as human beings. Equity has enforced its contracts strictly; generally speaking, it has worked honestly and, not infrequently, with considerable intelligence, to protect the actor's material interests. Going this far, we have often wondered why it did not go farther. If Equity could protect its members against managerial dishonesty, we could not understand why it was unable to protect them against managerial indecency.

It is not possible to approve a plan when all its details are "kept under cover," but we sincerely trust that under this new arrangement it will be found possible to cast out into exterior darkness those producers and managers whose depraved tastes have made the stage in many American cities a noisome compost of vulgarity, obscenity, and perversion. "Facts tend to show that some sort of censorship is inevitable," writes a columnist in the *Billboard*. We bow to those better informed, but, in our judgment, the censorship which consists in sporadic raids by the police is lamentably ineffective. Often it is a profitable advertisement for which the management is willing to pay. If Equity and its allied associations

can devise a workable form of self-censorship, preventing objectionable plays and revues from being presented at all, it will bring about a sorely needed reform.

Promoting Political Corruption

THE case of former Representative Harry E. Rowbottom, of Indiana, makes one wonder what courts are for. One of 435 members of the House, but otherwise unknown to fame, Mr. Rowbottom was sentenced by a Federal court to spend a year and a day in the penitentiary at Leavenworth. The actual sentence will be about eight months, for on November 9, Mr. Rowbottom will be released on parole. Among those who recommended this parole to the Federal Department of Justice are Senators Watson and Robinson, of Indiana, the Post Office Department, Judge Woodward, before whom the case was tried, the Rev. J. F. Rake, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Evansville, and C. C. Grubb, secretary of the Agoga Bible Class in that city. One lone objector is recorded, the District Attorney who prosecuted the case.

Here we have all the settings of a familiar and, most unfortunately, of a quite common story. Mr. Rowbottom made use of his official position to acquire information and influence which he readily turned into revenue. The charge on which he was convicted was the acceptance of bribes; more specifically, the sale of postmasterships to the highest bidder.

To sell a postmastership is not a deed that will shake the nation. The offices which Mr. Rowbottom sold, or which the Federal jury concluded that he sold, have generally been considered places of honor and trust; still, as these particular offices were all situated in small towns, it is quite possible that no irreparable harm was done. But that is about all that can be said in exculpation of Mr. Rowbottom.

In itself, the act was a blow struck against decent government. Its natural effect, possibly hindered in this case by local circumstances, is to make honest government impossible. When public offices are put on the block, it is quite obvious that they will be purchased by rascals. In a representative democracy, it is always difficult to debar the corrupting influence of money from politics. If a public official looks upon his position not as a public trust, but as a source of revenue, the task becomes quite impossible.

In politics as in so many other of life's activities, the medievalists were wiser than this generation. A man guilty of raising his hand against his neighbor might escape with his life, but not the man who raised his hand against rightful authority in the community. The first was a crime against one individual, but the second a crime which could react against every man and woman in that community.

We live in a softer and stupider age. Cleveland's assertion that every public office is a public trust is only a platform statement which few politicians take seriously. Today it is extremely difficult to send a corrupt public official to jail, and quite impossible to keep him there

long enough to serve a sentence proportionate to his offenses. The accused is rarely a burly ruffian, with an unshaven, underslung jaw. On the contrary, he is quite commonly good to the poor, giving them ten cents out of every one of his dishonest dollars, and a total abstainer from intoxicating liquors. Probably he has built a fine house for his poor old mother, and he may even be a teacher in a Sunday school.

What jury will send so admirable a citizen to the penitentiary? Or what parole board will allow him to languish in that durance vile, when two Senators of the United States, and the pastor of the First Baptist Church, beg that he be released?

Surely it is pertinent to ask what our courts are for. If Mr. Rowbottom was not guilty, he should not have been sentenced to spend even one day in a Federal penitentiary. Assuming with the jury that he was guilty, the action of the Federal Department of Justice in admitting him to parole after a few months, is nothing less than the most effective means of promoting political corruption.

The Needy

THE whole country is probably aroused to the necessity of providing for the poor during the rigors of the coming winter. Reports from our larger cities indicate that the local agencies of relief are well organized. Following the appeal of the Holy Father the Bishops have issued instructions which will bring home to every Catholic his duty of alms-giving.

But there are uncounted men and women who cannot be helped by any agency which restricts itself to the giving of temporal relief. Removed from the ills and misfortunes of this earth, they are detained in God's great prison house of Purgatory until they have paid the last farthing of their debt to His immutable justice. They hunger and thirst for no earthly bread and drink, but for God. Patient, uncomplaining, suffering, they await the day when their yearning for union with Him for whom they were created, can be encompassed. While we are concerned to aid our needy brethren at our doors, we must not forget our far more needy brethren in Purgatory.

We can combine charity to the living with charity to the dead, by making our alms a prayer for the souls of the Faithful departed. But there are other ways of helping them. We can pray for them. We can perform various acts of self-sacrifice for them. We can receive Holy Communion for them frequently, and when possible, daily. But we can help them most through the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Too often we pay our dead nothing but the barren tribute of tears. Grief expresses itself by flowers heaped up on the silent corpse, and forgets the appeal of the suffering soul for a remembrance in the Holy Sacrifice. During the coming month, the Church bids us remember our dead, even as we hope to be remembered when the little place we have had on earth is empty. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.

M. Musy, Catholic Politician

HERBERT G. KRAMER, S.M.

IHAD seen M. Jean Musy, Federal Councillor and, in 1930, President of the Swiss Confederacy, only once, just as I have seen Alfred E. Smith only once. But I welcomed the opportunity to see M. Musy again, for the same reasons why I want to see Mr. Smith again. Both M. Musy and Mr. Smith are Catholics. Both are politicians, but their politics are open, fearless, and based on principles of Christian justice.

The first time I saw M. Musy was at the solemn inauguration of the 1930-1931 term of the University of Fribourg, when, as guest speaker, he addressed the assembled students. After his speech emphasizing the need of the Catholic viewpoint in social and governmental activities, Bishop Besson, also present, said a few words, in fact, only one sentence, but a sentence charged with meaning: "*Fortunate is the nation whose Bishop can put his imprimatur on whatever its President says!*" And when His Excellency was about to give his episcopal blessing, the first to be on his knees was M. Musy, President of the Swiss Confederacy.

What M. Musy had to say was perhaps ordinary Catholic doctrine on current problems. But the fact that it was the President of a thoroughly modern government, which for years has been by no means favorably disposed to Catholicism, who was saying it, did almost more to arouse me than what he said. And that is really why I wanted to hear him and his opinions again.

The opportunity came on the first Sunday afternoon of this September. It was in the spacious yard of St. Michel College, the scene of Catholic activities ever since its foundation by St. Peter Canisius, over three centuries ago. The meeting followed a colorful parade through the time-trodden streets of Fribourg, and marked the closing of the "Social Week" of Catholic French Switzerland. Bands played while the crowd assembled and the speakers took their place on the platform on which Mass had been said in the morning.

I observed the crowd around me—Catholics of all ages from Geneva, Lausanne, Neuchâtel, Fribourg, and numerous Swiss villages—"peasants and townspeople, professional men and laborers, employers and employes," as M. Musy later put it in his talk. They all seemed proud, in a matter-of-fact way, of the religion which centuries of cantonal or family traditions had given them as their heritage. A man next to me, his fingers trembling with the nervousness of old age, put on his spectacles to see the speakers, and found pleasure in pointing out to his wife Bishop Besson and M. Musy, two leaders who are the pride of all Swiss Catholics. The sun showed itself and gave hopes of warming the air chilled by three cold and wet days which had covered the mountains to the south with an unusually early coat of snow.

When the chairman introduced M. Musy as the first speaker, the applause reminded me of the manifestation by the University students a year ago. M. Musy stood

a short moment before starting. Somehow, his small stature seemed to add to his greatness, his unassumingness to make him more commanding.

"... my compatriots . . ." The fact that he was speaking in his native canton, to some of the peasants of his own native village, confirmed his right to that term. "We are suffering not only from an economic crisis, but from a moral and social crisis as well, from a crisis which touches all human values, which knows no frontiers and which is reaching in certain countries a tragic acuteness." He attacks his subject without delay; being sure of his principles, he goes directly towards his end and speaks with all the force of his conviction. "Our ambition is to democratize our social and economic life." That is the keynote to his solution of the present crisis, based on the principle that "the economic system must reserve to man the place which is his due: the first."

"Strife between classes menaces our civilization with ruin. . . . It cannot end by the triumph of one class over all others. The Russian experiment has proven that the intended triumph of the proletariat, which is supposed to be the result, as also the termination, of the strife of classes, is in reality only its bloody continuation. The strife of classes can end only in the peaceful collaboration of all classes." The crowd was already responding by loud applause, cut short by M. Musy. He seems to consider applause as something quite secondary; for he never allows it to continue long.

"We put ourselves at the same time above capitalism and above Socialism. . . . We likewise oppose the absorption of the individual by the State, that is *étatisme* . . . Between absolute liberalism and Socialism realized through *étatisme*, between Manchester and Moscow, there there is an intermediate solution; it is individual liberty controlled by the State, to prevent private interests from defeating the general interest." A young man in front of me fainted. How odd, in an open yard cooled by a breeze which soon brought clouds over the sun and a light drizzle.

"Experience has already shown that simple changes of salary do not suffice to suppress the antagonism between employer and laborer, because they allow the principle of classes still to exist. On the contrary, a sharing of profits, appropriately adapted to the different situations, will probably give better results. It will realize a more intimate cooperation of labor and capital, a cooperation which is a practical means of ending the strifes which separate them. . . . The moral and material advantages of this reform would surpass its economic advantages. The revolt of the workman against capitalism originates directly in moral conditions created by the factory in which he is a stranger. The sharing of profits would lift the salaried worker from his depressing passivity, would develop in him a sense of responsibility and would make him the devoted collaborator of his employer. . . . Switzer-

land from this point of view is in advance of many countries. The social institutions of our great industries are models of their kind. Many of the rich among us continue to work and to live simply...." Another young man fainted! It could not be the atmosphere. I asked myself whether it was the enthusiasm which I, too, felt, which ran tingling waves down my spine—I who thought I viewed speeches in a rather cold, intellectual way, not emotionally.

"The dream of Marxism is a society in which the family becomes useless.... Whatever will diminish the authority of the family will find in us resolute adversaries.... Efficaciously to protect the family, especially that in which there is still the courage to have children, the view of labor as a merchandise must be definitely given up." The last sentence was interrupted by the loudest applause of the speech. The lustiest bravos came from the throats of young men. Encouraging, this, to a teacher, to see the younger people transported over a doctrine so much at odds with modern thought.

"When all members of society conscientiously fulfil all their duties as Christians, there will be no more illegal profits, no more injustice." Sentences such as these fired my soul with enthusiasm. My ardor, however, was aroused for different reasons than that of those around me. Their hearts were grasped by the power and sincerity of a fellow-countryman, become their political leader and the champion of their religion. I, an American, looking on from the outside, so to say, saw a politician, possess-

ing power over a nation as Protestant in traditional governmental policy as the traditions of his native canton are Catholic, fearlessly stand up for the Catholic principles he imbibed in his youth and urge his people to live their Faith in the face of modern unbelief.

"Bolshevism aims at the annihilation of Christian doctrine which has already been the great comforter of humanity. Through all the centuries, but especially in the hours of great crises, Christianity has triumphantly carried the banner of hope.... The only power capable of triumphing over Bolshevism and all inauspicious doctrines of which it is the incarnation, is the spiritual power. Ideas threaten the world; but the ideas which make man's grandeur will finally prevail upon those which diminish it.

"Let us be proud to fight for the highest moral, social and economic doctrine: Christianity. It is at this Divine source that poor humanity, misled and lost, must go to take its cure of rejuvenation."

Ordinarily, I would have remained for the other speeches. But, while a band struck up the tunes of the Swiss anthem, I wended my way through the crowd. My cup was filled, and it was sufficient for one day. As I walked home, I watched half a dozen mountains, whose new heads of snow towered behind the green hills, while the sun cast deep shadows upon their creviced sides. They stood out alone, I mused, in striking contrast with the hills, much as a few men like M. Musy stand alone above the mists of present-day politics.

Church and State in Spain

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

ONE of the prominent members of the provisional Spanish Government in a recent speech made a statement which must at first have startled his hearers. Known as a violent anticlerical, he denounced in unmeasured terms the forthcoming measure of the Constituent Cortes to disestablish the Church and bring about separation of Church and State. As reported by William F. Montavon, special correspondent of the N. C. W. C. News Service, in an important syndicated series of articles from Spain itself, this speaker, Melquiades Alvarez, declared "he had never been in favor of Church and State; he opposed separation of Church and State; to separate Church and State was dangerous: it would make the Church free!" Sr. Alvarez did not want the Church to be free.

This is the best commentary, and the better because unconscious, on what separation of Church and State really means in the minds of the sectarian agitators who have succeeded in doing in Spain what their predecessors did in Italy and France in the nineteenth century. Melquiades Alvarez was, perhaps, only a little more honest in saying what he really meant. A touch of hypocrisy comes into the declaration of the new Premier and Provisional President Azaña, when he told the world that he was a sincere admirer of American institutions and

meant to establish them in Spain. It may be that he took in his American readers, at least those who lack the imagination which is careful not to read foreign conditions in terms of their own. The outgoing President, Alcalá Zamora, was a little more realistic when he said in a signed statement in the *New York Times*:

The formula, as voted by the ministerial majority, is not a democratic one, nor is it a criterion of liberty, or consonant with the dictates of justice.... Not having succeeded in carrying through the liberal formula of tolerance and justice, I have resigned to devote myself to promote legal revision of the Constitution before other influences arise to attack it.

The formula alluded to by Alcalá Zamora was that referring to the suppression of teaching Religious Orders. It was the very next act of the Cortes after putting separation of Church and State into the Constitution, and nothing could have been a clearer demonstration of what in the minds of all Spaniards "separation" really meant. Comparison with the United States is especially cogent: we have "separation" of Church and State here, but we do not proscribe Religious Orders. When we say "free Church" we mean just exactly that; when the Mexican or Spanish or French anticlerical says "separation" he means submission. In fact, paradoxically, he does not mean separation at all, he means union. Alvarez,

as quoted by Mr. Montavon, made this clear: "Between the Church and State he would establish intimate union, even the union that binds the ward to her guardian. Civil authority, says Mr. Alvarez, must have the right to intervene in the affairs of the Church; civil authorities must exercise vigilance over the acts of the Church; control must be at all times in the hands of the civil power." Calles in Mexico in 1926 and Tejeda in Vera Cruz in 1931 meant nothing else.

The pressing question for Americans, therefore, is not to define what the Church means by union of Church and State, but to discover what the anticlericals mean by separation. It does not mean separation such as we have it in the United States, even our mild kind of separation, which tolerates organized Protestant ministers intervening in local and national politics to pass laws which reflect the "religious" or moral tenets of some particular sect. This actual so-called separation would be emphatically repudiated as actual union by President Azaña, who says he admires American institutions. Our theoretical separation, or a separation in fact for everybody, would also be repudiated by the followers of Azaña. The only kind of separation they will accept is really union, where the State runs the Church, though the Church has nothing to say about the State, in other words, "the union that binds the ward to her guardian," as Alvarez aptly puts it. But will the American people be allowed to know this fact? They will not. They will go on blithely imagining that there is separation of Church and State in Spain as we know it here. Why, your Spanish anticlerical would spurn our Constitutional separation with fear and loathing!

This will become clear by a short consideration of the concept of the so-called "lay State," the ideal of the Masonic fraternity, and of the new status of marriage, education, and ecclesiastical property in Spain.

The "lay State" is one of those misnomers which politicians use to throw dust in people's eyes, like "farm relief" with us, or "prosperity," or "Prohibition." It ought to mean that the State will be run by laymen without interference from the clergy, and according to the laymen's own ideas. But the laymen might happen to be Catholics and their ideas Catholic ideas, and it is quite possible they would take no dictation from the priests. But that would not be a lay State according to the Spanish or French idea. A real "lay State" is one which frankly denies the rights of God or the claims of religion over those who control the State or their legislation. Incidentally, it involves in practice the denial of all minority rights, or even, in some dictatorships, of majority rights. The talk of "the Church in politics" in such cases is dust in the eyes; when Catholics organize to defend their religious rights, the Church is said to be in politics, when they do not organize, they are scorned as backboneless.

The "lay school" is a corollary of the "lay State." It does not mean that only lay people may teach in schools, but that religion is rigidly excluded from the curriculum. Our public schools are lay schools. But the sectaries in Spain and France go further; they aim at nothing less than at "*l'école unique*" which means lay schools and

only lay schools. This would mean that, especially in elementary schools, there would be allowed no teaching of religion at all, even to those children whose parents demand it. This has already been achieved in Mexico.

The ironical thing about Spain is that after passing the decree abolishing the teaching Orders, these same Orders were forbidden, under pain of confiscation of property, to *stop* teaching! The express reason was that if they did stop, there would be hardly any schools or teachers left in Spain. The parallel with Mexico is complete; if it were not for the school buildings put up by the Church, there would be hardly any education in Mexico at all. Nevertheless it is the expressed intention of the Spanish revolutionaries to drive religious teaching out of Spain, as it is that of our own Scottish Rite Masons of the Southern Jurisdiction, who demand, in defiance of the Supreme Court: "All the children of all the people in the public schools."

The next action of the Cortes after disestablishing the Church and driving religion out of education was to legalize divorce by mutual consent. Here again the implied contrast with the United States is in our favor, lax as we are. The *New York Times* correspondent found only two countries with which to compare the new Spanish legislation: Russia and Mexico. Those who predicted that Alcalá Zamora was only the Kerensky of Spain, that a social revolution would quickly follow the political revolution, have been justified. It has become apparent that this misguided man was even less than that, he was merely the front for those behind who intended to revolutionize Spanish life in a thorough manner. With the Republic as such we have no fault to find; for an atheistic and despotic Republic we have only contempt.

Alcalá Zamora did, as a fact, act as a barrier by his resistance to such a revolution; with him out of the way, we may expect to see the same threatening movement gather all the more momentum for having been dammed up for months. Private property will probably be the next social institution to be attacked. The dominant position of the Socialists assures this prediction. At present Alejandro Lerroux seems to be the only man in the Government to hold out against them; and we shall undoubtedly see that he will be the next personality to bear the brunt of attack.

As a matter of fact, property rights have already been attacked in the person of the Religious Orders. It is always the same when a violent separation follows centuries of union of Church and State. The State demands usually at least equal ownership over Church property with the Church. In Mexico, which is always the model for such movements because the job was done so thoroughly there, the State demanded and usurped full rights; the Church there may not own anything, even the churches and schools which it built. It has been announced that the Spanish Government would compensate for any Church property which it would confiscate; at least it was announced under the Alcalá Zamora regime. What the new one will bring, remains to be seen.

The dictatorial powers granted Azaña by the decree of October 20 are ominous; he may punish severely those

who disobey "the law." Thus we will be treated to the same disgusting spectacle we witnessed in Mexico and Russia. We will be told there is no persecution, only enforcement of the "law." If "the priests" obey the law, all will be well. And the Church, defending its natural rights, will be branded as a lawbreaker, not a victim of persecution. And those who do not realize that it is the "law" itself which is persecution, will blindly believe it. Also, it is only a step, from the present penalties allowed, to confiscation of property, as the oil and railroad interests found to their cost in Mexico, and as the new invaders, the power interests, will also experience there.

From all this, it is evident how ill-informed on the situation was the editor of the Boston *Transcript*, who wrote on October 14: "The action of the National Assembly (*sic*) simply means that the Church will have to take care of itself, as it does in the United States, and keep out of politics." In his ignorance, he could not have written a crueler sentence. It is surprising to find a newspaper man "falling for" propaganda, for surely the press at least should know propaganda when it sees it, even when disguised. If the *Transcript's* prescription is followed, the Church will never be allowed to defend itself; it must suffer in silence whatever radical politicians wish to inflict on it, and that is what "taking care of itself" will amount to. The insinuation that the Church will ever be free in Spain as it is in the United States simply means that the writer of that editorial did not know what he was talking about.

Yet the Church should have nothing to fear from a Republic in Spain. It has on the whole got along well with France and Germany. The Vatican was among the first to recognize the new Republic. The Nuncio, Msgr. Tedeschini, has been on the friendliest terms with the new Government, and his handling of the difficult situation has made Europeans* compare it favorably with Cardinal Pacelli's diplomacy in Germany, which won him the post of Secretary of State. It is both the theory and the tradition of the Holy See that forms of government are indifferent to it. It has a good word for all of them, provided they are just and honest in their dealings. It has an excellent record of being able to compromise on details while firmly holding to principles. Mexico, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, are examples of this in recent years. If Spain does not take the line of trying to crush religion, it will find the Holy See more than willing to meet it half-way.

It is thus we must interpret its attitude on the separation of Church and State in Spain. The protest from the Pope, so much expected by some, did not materialize. It is Catholic theory that there must be union of Church and State where there is unity of religion; it has always been Catholic practice to accept, and even to support, separation when this unity is obviously broken, as it is in France, Spain, and Mexico. It is true that Spain stands to most people as a thoroughly Catholic people. The most sensible words on this thorny subject were spoken by Alcalá Zamora in his statement in the *New York Times*:

In my opinion, it is futile to discuss whether believing Catholics represent the majority or minority in Spain. If they are in the majority, there is no power under democratic conditions to legislate against their feelings. If they are in the minority, they are entitled to receive proper protection; with respect to their individual rights, there should be a guarantee against abuses by the State and by public authorities.

There is no escape from that dilemma. On its solution depends the future history of Spain.

Modernity in Education

G. C. HESELTINE

LET me hasten to assure the readers of *AMERICA* that it is not without hesitation that I venture to write upon a subject on which they are so well informed. I know of no periodical so well supplied in this matter by people who are obviously soaked in their subject. But my position is quite different from theirs. It is that of the plain philistine who pretends to no knowledge of the *arcana* of the craft of teaching, one who is interested more in its effects upon mankind than in the tricks of the trade.

Here, looking at the thing called education in a general way, it seems to me that the first and greatest modern blunder is to consider "letters" as essential to education. The first step in modern education is apparently to teach children to read and write. As evidence of advance in education and civilization we are told that in the days of our grandparents only five, or ten, or some other small percentage, could read and write. Now every child is taught to read and write, though it would be an exaggeration to say that every child learns to read and write.

The modern educational expert imagines that this trick of letters is a step towards education, whereas it is a mere trick like any other, such as teaching children to stand on their heads or palm playing cards. The result of two or three generations of education on this basis is not a population that can even read and write. The small proportion of the population in the professional classes may read and write tolerably well. The rest rarely have occasion to do either and any teacher who has to read father's or mother's written excuse for Tommy's non-attendance or lateness at school, must weep to think what the production of that piece of illiteracy has cost.

The maximum result that is obtained by teaching the masses to read and write is that most of them can read the newspapers, though they cannot, indeed, understand them. The masses learn just enough to be able to read and swallow whatever dope the press prepares for them. They know just enough letters to be able to read a lying advertisement (perhaps there are none in America—England is full of them), but they do not know enough to realize when an advertisement is lying.

This business of teaching every child indiscriminately to read and write results in nothing more than mass illiteracy. The man who reads and writes very badly, as the great majority do today, is more illiterate than the man who does not read or write at all. Nobody would have dreamed of reproaching the craftsman of the pre-machine age with being illiterate because they could

not read or write, any more than one would reproach the Editor of AMERICA for not being able to weave cloth. The tasks are quite distinct and were never in themselves essential to the process of education. But it is quite true that more than one modern captain of industry can neither read nor write—there is in London a rich theater magnate who must have his letters read to him and sign his name with a cross. Yet it would be dangerous on that account to call him uneducated.

Just as letters may be used as a means of acquiring education, they may be used as a means of acquiring invincible ignorance. It is no great gain to a man if he uses the little ability to read, which elementary education has given him, in order to read the novels of Miss Gertrude Stein, the "history" of H. G. Wells, the "philosophy" of Bertrand Russell. For unless he can also criticize and evaluate these works as he reads them, he is in grave danger of being gulled by them and soaking himself in disastrous ignorance. That is the great danger of the modern system of producing mass illiteracy. It would be better that a man cannot read.

Men are taught to read and by the accumulation of "facts" in their reading they acquire what is roughly called "knowledge," and wrongly "education." They are not given the faintest vestige of understanding. That is what is wrong with modern education. It may teach tricks, even tricks that sharpen the intelligence, or (like those of salesmanship) that fill the pocket, but it leaves the understanding untouched.

In addition to reading and writing, the elementary curricula include sufficient arithmetic for a man to know what a reduction in wages means, not quite enough geography to know that Galileo did not discover that the earth was round, and a succession of meaningless dates which are called "history." "Histories," says the great Francis Bacon, "make men wise." But if the histories in the United States are no better written than they are in England (and I don't see why they should be) they make men very foolish. In England, according to the historians, history proper began when Henry VIII threw off the allegiance to the Pope—prior to that was a prehistoric barbarity. History, according to the book from which I was taught, says that Cranmer was martyred and John Fisher was executed. She is a one-sided jade. I cannot think much of education that depends on *her*.

Francis Bacon, who was reputed a very learned man, said that "reading maketh a full man, conference a ready man, writing an exact man," but he never said that any of them made an educated man. What he did say to the point was: "Therefore, since custom is the principal magistrate of a man's life, let men by all means endeavour to obtain good customs. Certainly custom is most perfect when it beginneth in young years; *this we call education.*" It is true that Bacon did not prove a great credit to his educators, because he was a hypocrite, and dishonest, and came to a bad end; but on his theory of education he might retort that education was not merely a matter of being honest. He meant, in that sentence about early customs, exactly what the great Bishop William of Wykeham, who founded the public-school system nearly six

centuries ago, meant by his motto "Manners maketh Man."

Education is, or should be, the making of a man, Bacon's "full man." It has nothing whatever to do with cramming knowledge into a child or teaching it slight-of-hand tricks with a pen for the purpose of forcing it through examinations. The process, from the very origin of the word, is exactly that of the farmer when he raises corn from seed—it is the process of bringing to full fruition. But by the very nature and quality of manhood, it must concern the mind, and, as the Church teaches clearly and emphatically, the soul.

Within the scope of Bacon's "custom" and Wykeham's "manners," come what we call conduct and behavior. It would be superfluous for me in this place to labor the point that the great tendency of modern secular education is to eliminate the moral training inherent in religious teaching, without which there can be no education in manners and conduct. As a man is body and soul, the full man will not flourish without the education of both. It is a self-evident Christian postulate which modern educational heresy denies.

The typically modern folly of the modern educationists is to assume that there was little or no education in the world until the advent of modern State education, just as the modern scientist assumes that there was no scientific knowledge until the invention of the modern jargon, and the higher critic assumes that no Gospel was authentic until he had proved it so. The facts are that medieval education was extraordinarily efficient and it was accessible to all who wanted it, *even the very poorest*. It would be at least a little rash to assume that the educators of Dante, St. Thomas Aquinas, William of Wykeham, Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Copernicus, and St. Robert Bellarmine, had much to learn from the moderns. The first obvious difference in their methods was that they, or their system, *discriminated*. They did not try to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. They did not try to force the whole hoi-polloi through one sieve, to be shaped on one pattern. Those who showed an aptitude for letters were given letters and those who were fit for crafts were taught crafts.

The ordinary social behavior proper to human nature was learnt, as it should be, mimic-fashion in the home. Those who needed more of it for use in the wider world learned it at school. The result was that many more men became full men, that is many more men were educated. Their manhood came to fruition as it was developed, opened out, expressed, as it flourished or flowered in their crafts and their daily lives. Their manhood had a means of expression in their craft, their art, or their scholarship. The artisan's education flowered in his workmanship, the soldier's in his chivalry, the scholar's in his letters. And let it be noted that the essential part of a scholar's education was not the craft of the scribe; it was the "humanities." The classics and history, the story of mankind in legendary or factual form, especially his spiritual story, was at the core of Scholastic education. "The proper study of mankind is man," wrote the poet.

One heresy breeds another. The indiscriminate "edu-

cation" applied to all alike under the State systems is the result of the heresy of the equality of man. The theological doctrine of the equality of man has nothing whatever to do with the secular nonsense that goes under the same phrase. It does not mean that all men are alike or that all men are amenable to the same treatment. This is a typical sort of error encouraged by mass illiteracy. A phrase like "the equality of man" is seized upon but no attempt is made to understand it. It is repeated parrot-fashion as a slogan by the demagogues and it has led to the uproarious modern confusion about democracy.

It is one of the chief results of the State insistence on a minimum general level of illiteracy, that there is a general low level of misunderstanding of political problems. The Demos is just sufficiently "educated" to believe what it reads in the Hearst press or in the Communist propaganda sheets. The peasant or craftsman who cannot read is far more canny, he has too much native commonsense and caution, too much mother wit, to be gulled by the caption or the noisy jaw. It is he of whom it has been well said that you can fool some of the people some of the time but not all the people all the time. The modern "educated" democracy can be fooled all the time, and it is. It has allowed the State to filch away its liberty bit by bit, it has allowed industry to be so exploited that it is at the mercy of the system, it has allowed the State to usurp the functions of the family, to take away from the common man the responsibilities of his manhood, the things that go to make him a full man, an educated man.

The current nonsense about democracy is without doubt the greatest evil of the modern educational heresy. It is in itself evidence of the failure of the educational system when the masses are given a swelled head, and they believe that Demos, the great myriad-headed moron, can rule or control the destinies of mankind. His intelligence is that of his lowest common factor and he is at the mercy of the glib tongue or the cunning head. His "education" really disarms him.

Before the days of compulsory State education, all of one kind, men recognized the diversities of ability in one another. Society made use of and benefited from those

diversities. It recognized the functions that made kings and judges, bishops and builders, soldiers and saints, poets and painters. Nor were these men all expected to come to the full flower of their diversity out of the same mass-production system of education.

It is perhaps not surprising that in a materialistically-minded, grab-and-snatch civilization, the esthetic factors in education should be neglected. It is no argument to say that reading, writing, arithmetic, algebra, and whatnot, are employed to develop the intelligence; the arts of painting, sculpture and music could be used for the same purpose, and be of value to a man afterwards. But they are not. What on earth can we say of the cheap-jack and ephemeral "salesmanship," "hygiene," bad "economics," and catchpenny "philosophy" that supplement the curricula of the high schools? They may make a man "smart" in business, teach him to wash his face, and give him a smattering of intellectual smartaleckry. They do not make him a full man. There are some things a man may be a better man for knowing. They are not business tricks, the dodging of sexual responsibilities, or the production of potted platitudes.

The recent Papal Encyclical has amply defined the relative educational functions and duties for the present. It would be presumptuous of me to comment further. I can only observe the effects of past neglect of the principles of the Encyclical. They are the growth of a generation devoid of personal and moral responsibilities, as easily led as a donkey by a carrot, a generation which thinks H. G. Wells a historian and Bertrand Russell a philosopher. It is a striking comment on the state of education that Russell should be called a philosopher, even by people one might expect to know better. He is reckoned a very modern up-to-date educationalist, too, for he runs a school where children are never corrected or punished but allowed to grow up all hairy, irresponsible, and promiscuous, like rabbits.

To the millions with a conviction of the Christian philosophy of the End of Man, a man cannot be a full man whose education takes no account of personal sanctity. What do the directors of the great modern State educational systems think of *that*?

Can France and Germany Get Together?

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD

SINCE the armistice of 1918, innumerable worries have beset the two leading Republics of Europe: France and Germany. The former is on the apex of her power, the latter is trying to regain some of her lost might and prestige. Out of this wide gap grows the controversy which threatens to block the path to reconciliation. But the difficulties are by no means insurmountable. If the French and the German people were to vote today on rapprochement, regardless of newspaper opinion, of security, of disarmament, Versailles treaty, minorities, War guilt and so on, undoubtedly, the overwhelming majority would be in favor of reconciliation.

Politics, prejudice, and suspicion, however, prevent such an easy plebiscite. The representatives of the two countries differ very widely on the subject of rapprochement. If, in spite of the differences of opinion, the aim and ambition to bring the two traditional enemies under one hat, is as steadfastly pursued as at any time in the past, it is because the goal seems well worth the price of mutual sacrifice.

Nothing less than the peace and prosperity of Europe depend on the successful outcome of the negotiations. If France and Germany were reconciled, it would mean the end of fears and disputes. Cooperation and mutual

understanding will take the place of hatred and age-old suspicion, and where formerly one was only too eager to assail the other with or without adequate reason, under the new arrangement the Continent would be all brotherhood and peace and confidence.

The greatest obstacle to a friendly Europe would be removed through disarmament. Guns and rifles, gunpowder and gases, tanks and airplanes, would be dropped by small and large nations like the proverbial hot cake in face of the tremendously powerful Franco-German union. An alliance between Italy and Spain or Poland and the Balkans or even a threatening gesture on the part of the Soviet Republic would mean next to nothing as compared with the *poilu* and the Prussian *Pickelhaube* marching hand in hand.

The high tariff walls which have been built around France and Germany would rapidly shrink to insignificant proportions. The mighty cartels of the French, of German iron and steel industry, of fertilizers, of coal, of textiles, and many other commodities would combine within unified and orderly arranged markets. Where there was, in past years, a multitude of small selling areas, there would rise one great market similar to the continental market of the United States.

The deep chasm between German poverty and French wealth would rapidly be bridged by better distribution of the French gold reserves now rusting in the vaults of the *Banque de France*. Extensive loans would be granted to the German Government, to industry and agriculture. And as the abundance of French wealth would find a ready and worthwhile outlet within German boundaries, so would German business experience secure a powerful impetus with the help of bitterly needed funds.

If the needs of the two countries are, to all appearances, so nicely adapted to each other's opportunities, what prevents them from getting together and making the most of it? Let us lift the veil a bit and steal a glance at what is going on behind the scenes of obvious good will and unequaled opportunity.

Victory in 1918 rewarded France with absolute predominance on the Continent. Her army is superior to that of any European friend or foe. She has the biggest gold reserve with the sole exception of the United States. France is one of the countries (that can be counted on the fingers of one hand) whose prosperity has not yet become a legend. And her political power is well-nigh a hegemony based on her unchallenged power in the West and on a number of alliances (strengthened by long-term loans) with Balkan nations in the East of Europe.

France has come close to reaping the maximum benefits from a victorious war. She has no desire other than to consolidate these gains, to "stabilize victory." She is eager to bring the scheme of a united Europe to an early realization, she is more than willing to discuss Franco-German rapprochement but—Germany must be ready to accept the *status quo* and must recognize that a lost war makes her subordination essential.

Now take Germany: the War and the subsequent inflation period robbed the country of its greatest asset: the buying power of the middle classes. An overtaxed war

industry had to be modernized, agriculture to be subsidized; but the country was impoverished. Foreign loans poured into Germany; the United States has presently invested close to three billions of dollars. The average income is taxed about thirty per cent, unemployment is growing, and so is the Federal Government's deficit. Reparations amount to \$400,000,000 annually, and interest on foreign loans run to about the same amount. Since the people are poor, reparations must come out of an export surplus. However, the world market is overcrowded as it is, and the Germans ask: "where to sell our products and how to pay reparations?"

Germany maintains that she is too poor to live and too rich to die. She wants a cut in the reparations debt so that she can balance her budget and offer foreign financiers better investment policies. She wants her colonies back, she insists on a solution of the problem of minorities in Silesia, the Danzig Corridor, and Tyrol, especially. In short, she wants equality with France.

These are the barest facts as they are reflected in the economic background. The political aspect is not less important because it brings to the fore that suspicion, hatred, and misunderstanding which might be considered the real obstacle in the way of the realization of good will and cooperation.

France remarks that Germany signed the peace treaty, and treaties should be considered sacred documents. But even if France consents to a change of one or the other clause, Germany is insatiable; she always keeps on asking for more and "when is this going to stop?" Germany asked for the Dawes Plan—and she got it. Then she asked for evacuation of the Rhine (five years in advance)—and she got it. Then she followed it up with the demand for the Young Plan—and she got it. Now she is clamoring for another Plan. As Stephane Lauzanne, editor in chief of the *Matin*, says: "If we replace the Young Plan, what guarantees shall we have that six months later we shall not be asked to make still further sacrifices?"

Germany maintains, however, that her suggestion for an armistice was based on the fourteen Wilsonian points which were held up enticingly before the eyes of a courageously fighting people only to be dropped in the subsequent peace negotiations. The peace treaty was signed "at pistol point"; the War-guilt clause, it is held, has been practically cancelled by the established fact that other European nations are at least as guilty. An entirely new deal all around is necessary to establish peace in Europe, a deal which must give Germany equality with France.

The difficulties in the path of reconciliation loom large, indeed; but, as said before, they are neither insurmountable nor may their solution be very far off. Both countries have gone through too much suffering to close their eyes to the danger of prolonged enmity. The economic pressure in Germany makes people appreciative of the fact that they have to rely on France for financial large-scale help since the United States is too busy with its own depression. By the same token, indications in France are that prosperity will not be of long duration unless

reconciliation is effected. For the Franco-German scuffle will leave Europe in a disorderly condition which, naturally, will have its effect on French industry, finance and commerce.

Thus, there can be observed in both countries strong and rather popular currents pointing to rapprochement. Out of this sentiment and concluding from utterances of statesmen and politicians, it may be said that both countries show a willingness to sacrifice some of their demands and to put pride and patriotism aside for a while. Thus, France would very likely agree to a reduction of the debt reparations assuming that the United States would take the initiative and accept a substantial debt reduction. Furthermore, France might not object to the restitution of at least two former German colonies, namely Kamerun and Togoland. It is also apparent that Briand and his associates take a true interest in a solution of the harassing minorities problem. But most important of these and other concessions would be the French financial help which would enable Germany to balance her budget and get back on the road to financial security. This would likely be the price France would be willing to pay for the relief of fear and apprehension which has surrounded her for more than a century.

In Germany, again, more and more people become convinced that the era of pure politics is passed and that an era of economics is about to make its bow. The fact is appreciated that Germany's strength lies in her geographical position which dominates Europe; in her powerful industry which in capacity and in "up-to-date-ness" excels any other industry in Europe; in her method of "rationalization," that means organization to the formula of an abstract law (one might say: the triumph of the spirit of geometry); in organized labor; in highly developed arts and science, and so forth. The spirit of brilliant parades and of monarchical might is today largely restricted to a fraction of the followers of "Handsome" Adolf Hitler, and the glorious Germany of 1914 has definitely been buried in the turmoil of revolution and inflation.

It is for this reason that I have, in my talks with German editors and bankers, frequently found the opinion that France should be left the "toy of military armaments"; first, because it would be useless to try to convince the average French citizen that he is not living any more in the Bonapartean era, and second, because Germany would get muddled up in her restoration work if she really tried to match France in armaments which would involve billions of dollars which, needless to say, Germany can ill afford to spend.

If France is so anxious to stick to her political predominance, many Germans maintain, by all means let her have it. What is not said but is quite as clear, is that Germany will, in the meantime, attempt to assure herself of economic predominance.

Under these auspices, France and Germany may first meet on common ground if the negotiations of a Pan-European scheme at Geneva enter into the stage of actual cooperation. This is somewhat facilitated by the recent renunciation of an Austro-German customs union, which

leaves Germany as well as Austria free to deal with France separately instead of as an alliance which, rightly or wrongly, provoked the strongest suspicion of Briand's country.

The urgent demand for loans on the part of Germany and the not-less-bitterly needed market for investments of French capital may prove a further stimulus for rapprochement. And there is, finally, the competitive fight now going on between the great German and French industrial enterprises which is harmful to both. An overcrowded world market, the fall in prices, a greatly reduced demand for all kinds of goods makes cooperation instead of competition advisable. While sporadic negotiations have been taken up and, indeed, led to success in some cases, such an effort may, under the sponsorship of the respective government, easily be enlarged into large-scale agreements.

Rapprochement is still in its primitive stage but there are hopeful signs that the near future will see a new page turned over in the history of Franco-German relations, a history which, up to now, has seen nothing but revenge and bloodshed. Maybe Mr. Hoover may discuss it with M. Laval.

Education

Edison as an Educator

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

THE inscription on the Medal of Congress, presented in 1924, "He illuminated the paths of progress by his inventions," does not satisfy a public which long ago enshrined Thomas Alva Edison as a supreme genius in science. Yet it is singularly just. What Edison actually accomplished can never be forgotten, and his place in the scientific world needs no support from claims that at best are half truths. It is enough to say that, with very few exceptions, he contributed to, and often improved, every invention that has been made for the last fifty years. By the prodigious activity and achievements of this intense period, Edison's real worth is to be estimated.

But while he worked wonders that "illuminated the paths of progress," often he did not know why these marvels worked, or how. As Nikola Tesla wrote, in the *New York Times* for October 19, he trusted entirely to a kind of "instinct and practical sense." He thought of sources of energy that might be transformed into motion, or sound, or light, and when the car moved, the phonograph spoke, and the electric lamp illuminated a city street, he was not at pains to go back to ultimate causes. His mind was not made to generalize. He had a supreme contempt for mathematics, and no taste whatever for metaphysics, rejecting both as arid theorizing. Although for many years he worked in one field, he added nothing to our pitifully small sum of pure science. He could make things, and do things, and he had all the limitations of his capabilities.

These limitations bound him more tightly than he knew, and his superb gift for hard work could not always break through them. Tesla writes that "his method was in-

efficient in the extreme, for an immense ground had to be covered to get anything at all, unless blind chance intervened, and, at first, I was almost a sorry witness of his doings, knowing that just a little theory and calculation would have saved him ninety per cent of his labor." The investigator who deliberately closes his mind to established truths, as Edison did to mathematics and metaphysics, may succeed in his task, just as it is possible for a visitor to climb the stairways to the top of the Empire State Building. But he will save both time and energy for his work, if he takes the elevator.

Had Edison turned to mathematics, the secrets which lay just beyond the last researches of Clerk Maxwell might now be commonplaces of the shop. Had he not relied almost entirely on methods that were wholly empirical, he might today be ranked with Newton. But, as Tesla notes, "everything he achieved was the result of persistent trials and experiments, often performed at random." This may be magnificent, in its disregard of hard work, but is it science? What the world lost by Edison's reliance on empiricism may well be as inestimable as the value of the devices which he perfected, in spite of his random methods.

In the last years of his life, Edison "found himself outstripped by detail workers," writes a well-informed biographer, in the *New York Herald-Tribune*. "His vast miscellaneous knowledge did not equip him for the work of pushing the advance of knowledge in smaller areas, which had to be abandoned to specialists." In these years, he "found himself partly defeated by his versatility and universality." He read widely, and "few men have ever gorged their minds with reading matter in such encyclopedic variety."

Untrained to habits of exact thought, he read uncritically. Egged on by the press which continually sought for interviews, he fell into the habit of discussing almost any subject proposed to him. The result gave the impression of a man who knew a little about everything, but not very much about anything. He dogmatized, with a boldness equalled only by the inaccuracy of his dogmas, on topics ranging from the immortality of the soul—which, quite commonly, he identified with the physical constituents of the brain—to the ultimate constitution of matter. Since education (or what passes for it in this country) is our national established church, it was inevitable that Edison soon found in the press a pulpit from which to preach reform in education. His views must be gathered from scattered newspaper reports, for, so far as I know, Edison never signed a book, or even an article, on this or any other topic.

But educators did not welcome his criticisms. Some of it, undoubtedly, was good, as when he told them that while a college graduate need not be an encyclopedia, he ought at least know how to spell and how to write a letter. Woodrow Wilson once remarked, when president of Princeton, that in the opinion of some educators, the mind was a kind of a bag, and education consisted in cramming it with brute knowledge. Edison was not by profession an educator, but that seems to have been his theory. His famous questionnaires were little more than

lists of what examiners term—and wise examiners omit—"fact questions." When a man "knew" a number of facts, he was an educated man, and the best-educated man was he who knew as many as an encyclopedia, and could use most of them to bring about, in some fashion, some material advantage. Edison never grasped the difference between wisdom and learning, or even between knowledge and information, and probably did not suspect that there was any. Culture had but a small part in his educational program, and religion none at all.

For good reasons, this synthesis of fact knowledge and material progress did not commend itself to philosophers in the schools, or out of them. Even the technical schools failed to extend it a welcome, for it came at the very time when teachers were beginning to realize that the student ought not only to know how to wind an armature, but what an armature was, and the ultimate reasons—as far as these could be discovered—which made it an armature. A student needed eyes, they thought, but he stood in sorer need of a brain back of those eyes, and a training in stark, abstract, grinding mathematics and philosophy, to teach him how to use both brain and eyes. While Edison was insisting upon shopwork and empiricism, they were insisting upon a book conned under the midnight oil and abstract rational processes. They knew Edison's theory; it was not new; and teachers had concluded that, taken by itself, it was unsatisfactory. Theory, corrected and improved, or rejected, by investigation and the tests of actuality, they deemed a better basis of education in the physical sciences.

That he found no place in education for religion is clear. Here again his inability to rationalize served him badly. With millions of others in this pagan country, he had lived three-score years and ten without concerning himself greatly about religion, and in his old age he pronounced it "superstition" and "bunk." The simple fact is that he had never examined it; and like Darwin, who confessed that exclusive preoccupation during many years with scientific investigation had stolen away his power of enjoying Shakespeare, Edison at seventy was probably unfitted to subject religion to an adequate and rational examination. His approach to religion was largely a series of negations, none of them critically established. Once asked what "God" meant to him, he answered promptly "nothing," and a series of explanations, none, so far as I recall, offered by himself, confirmed rather than dissipated the significance of his reply.

However he seems later to have risen above some of his cruder notions, such as his identification of the soul with the brain, and to have admitted the possibility of an immortality consisting in the survival of vital forces "each in itself a unit of life, living in the body cells, but not visible even to the ultra microscope." But he did not believe that "a human being has a conscious life after death in any form, spiritual or physical." In an interview, published in the *Scientific American*, for October 30, 1920, he said, "I cannot conceive of such a thing as spirit. Imagine something which has no weight, no material form, no mass, in a word, imagine nothing."

Yet, if this criterion of objective truth be admitted,

physical science itself is bankrupt. It is a revelation of Edison's lack of intellectual fiber that the inconsistency of his argument disturbed him not a whit. But it is pleasant to know that the man himself was better than his negative religion. Indifferent to money, he was considerate of his workmen, and in his private life, generous and kindly.

Tesla uses a comparison, deprecating Edison's excessive empiricism, which illustrates excellently the genius of the great inventor. "If he had a needle to find in a haystack, he would not stop to reason where it would most likely be, but would proceed at once, with the feverish diligence of a bee, to examine straw after straw until he found the object of his search." However open to criticism his methods might be, Edison was never afraid of hard work. His achievements, and their practical value to the world, undoubtedly stimulated scientific research, and led to the abolition of some antiquated methods in teaching. But could Edison have impressed his lesson of hard work upon the young men and women who annually flock to our colleges and universities, his contribution to education would have been of incomparably greater value. That he failed, is not to be counted his fault, for he taught by example, and that is the best teaching a man can give. Perhaps the fault lies with some of the educators who, while Edison was preaching the gospel of hard work, were showing their veneration for the sanctity of the student's gifts, by introducing him to the elective system, along with credits, and other devices for securing an education at a low rate, on easy payments.

Economics

Advertising to the Rescue

AUGUSTINE SMITH

NOBODY can deny that during the past two years, the economic fabric of this country has been shot full of holes. Everybody is talking about the depression and everybody has a panacea. But at last the sun is about to shine for the harassed business man. The economic millennium is at hand. In the *New York Times*, and, I daresay, in every leading paper of the country, the news was recently broadcast. A certain advertiser, himself in the advertising and sales-promotion business, has found the philosopher's stone that will transmute bad times into good. It is advertising.

The advertisement takes up almost a half-page of space to tell the world that "fear forces millions to hoard their cash. Savings banks report an increase in deposits of several million dollars—money which would normally go into the purchase of homes, automobiles, furniture, shoes, food, entertainment, and other necessities and conveniences of living." The advertiser, further, goes on to state that "business will approach normal in two years." The reason is that "the excesses of overproduction have been pretty well cured and a return to normal buying psychology will cause retailers to order and thus set factory wheels to humming." But what will unloosen the purse strings of these moral lepers who have been so unpatriotic as to

put their money in savings banks? What will make these misers come to the aid of their country? Advertising!

Here, then, lies the great cure-all for our ills. Start the old tricks that helped cause overproduction, that made millions spend like the proverbial fool who is soon parted from his money—start advertising, and pressing the people to buy something they may not want, and probably do not need. High-pressure salesmanship (the advertisement uses the words "aggressive selling") is what helped the country to its present state; yet here we see advertising which actually recommends a revival of the same methods.

For the first time since the inflated salaries of the post-War period, people are probably learning to save. That is, those who do not belong to the six million or more who are at present earning nothing at all. And we see already a campaign going forward to help these people begin spending their surplus money.

High-pressure salesmanship, overadvertising or whatever you wish to call it, is not only unethical, but actually poor business. But some people never learn.

A legitimate advertisement of one's goods, explaining its values and its use, is surely a commendable way of reaching the public. But when a man is hounded by the fear of some new disease that he will surely get, unless he buys a certain drug, or if he sees his romance about to be wrecked because his fiancée cannot endure the odor of his breath (and even his best friend won't tip him off to this sad state), it seems that the man is being duped into buying a product. It boils itself down to this: that the advertising is indubitably clever, and the mass of the public is desperately dull. Such tactics to relieve the gullible of their hard-earned cash are suspiciously like taking candy from a baby. Yet it is done, it is considered smart advertising.

Years ago, in our economic scheme, there was no god but saving, and Benjamin Franklin with his wise saws, was its prophet. Today we are not only being encouraged to spend, nay, we are being forced to do it. Then when business crashes, and the paladins of industry close their factories to save money for themselves, the wiseacres are astonished to see so many men in the breadlines. "To think that after all the high wages, these improvident fellows have not managed to save enough to tide themselves over a few months of depression!"

It is ridiculous to attempt even a short list of the "easy-payment plans," and the great values outlined in the post-War period, to separate the working man from his cash. It was the first time in the history of this nation that the working people had money. They were drunk with it. The manufacturers and advertisers, always quick on the trigger, concocted bounteous schemes for separating them from their money. As soon as their purses were drained, the working men got the laugh for being so gullible.

Truly there is a vicious circle here. The employer expects the employe to keep his money in circulation. Even after the employe has been fired, the poor fellow is still expected to keep doing the same thing. There is a charming picture in the thought of a workman in the

cigarette factory getting paid on Saturday, and then buying a pack of the cigarettes he has helped make, at a goodly percentage over their original cost. And why? So the owners of the concern can vote themselves a hearty dividend. Wouldn't it be too bad if the worker would not buy any more "Toasted Camels" and the owners could not cut their fat melon of profits? If that should happen on a large scale, with the public joining in, the "Toasted Camel" firm would experience a depression.

The prevailing opinion in business seems to be something like this. If a firm makes \$20,000 in 1929, and only \$17,000 in 1930, something terrible has happened. It is time to cut wages and fire a few people. This is the outward sign of a depression. The owners are losing money. There isn't as much income to split up among themselves. The mere fact that they may each have several hundred thousand dollars invested, and paying good interest means nothing.

There is, I believe, an axiom in the spiritual life, that one either progresses or goes back. There is no standing still. Big business has taken this axiom over unto itself. It is the only spiritual thing about it. Business must increase every year, or else—heaven protect the working man.

Now just why business must increase every year, and so on *ad infinitum*, nobody knows. Everything else in the natural order reaches, as it were, a saturation point sooner or later. Nobody would think of eating each day more and more food, on the principle that the more one eats, the better one becomes. A given man can normally eat a certain amount of food each day. Some days he eats less, because he needs less. Some days he eats more because he needs more. But he does not go on each day increasing the amount of food in an arithmetical progression. By the end of two weeks he would be near *rigor mortis*, or at least have one of the more interesting types of indigestion.

So it is with any given product. A manufacturer can increase his sales every year up to a certain point. Beyond that they will not go. They may stay at that point. The manufacturer is lucky if they do. But they may, and probably will drop. After all, only so many persons can possibly use bathtubs or automobiles, or what have you, at any specified time. If the manufacturer continues making automobiles when there is no demand, we have the phenomenon which the economists in their quaint way call "overproduction."

One of the great and potent ways of reaching this saturation point is by high-pressure salesmanship and too aggressive advertising. This causes people to buy when they should not buy, or do not need the product. It speeds up the cycle of demand, until that demand is satisfied so quickly that it makes the manufacturer's head swim.

Now the only answer to such a condition is not, as some would have us believe, more advertising, working the potential field still harder. That is merely tilling barren ground. The answer is that the manufacturer should try, if possible, to be less greedy for big profits. He should not expect that every year there must be more and more sales. If such a thing were possible, corporations would

swell until they would stultify themselves by their own magnitude. But most of the manufacturing fraternity seek a larger and larger income every year, and the advertising men abet them. The taste for money breeds the taste for more money, and so they go on trying to force people to buy.

From even a cursory glance, it will readily be seen that greed does not, in the long run, pay. But some people will never learn. If there are a few million dollars in savings banks, they will try to figure out some way of getting it out and in circulation. And then what? Well, then I suppose they can do what they have been doing—buy some nice new shiny pens and more barrels of red ink and work on the debit side of the ledger for a while. That is, if they haven't fired the bookkeeper in the meantime to cut down expenses.

With Scrip and Staff

THROUGH the short-wave radio, Signor Marconi, on Columbus Day, October 12, of this year, switched on the illumination for the grandiose statue of Christ the King on Monte Corcovado, at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. More than fifty of the Bishops of Brazil had attended the national Catholic congress during the eight preceding days, when Pope Pius XI's Encyclical on the Reign of Christ, "Quas primas," was studied and discussed. All the Catholic Action organizations of the nation took part in the congress. The proceedings included a solemn pontifical Mass in the famous Church of Our Lady of Candelaria, an open-air Mass, a eucharistic vigil, a procession, etc. The event was heralded as a magnificent testimony to the faith of Brazil.

On Sunday, October 25, a superb bronze statue of Christ the King was unveiled at the Loyola House of Retreats, Morristown, N. J. The statue, erected at a cost of \$25,000, is the gift of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Herbermann, of Jersey City, N. J., and is the work of the well-known sculptor, Harry L. Raul, of Orange, N. J.

Although not a Catholic, Mr. Raul devoted a couple of years of thought and labor to his work, studying types of the Redeemer, and sinking himself in the concept of Christ the King. The statue stands in the garden of the Retreat House, and aims to picture to the retreatant the majestic yet brotherly relation of the Christ to the manhood of His Kingdom, to whom He has confided a share in His apostolate.

The standing figure was chosen: Christ the King as leader and inspirer to action; rather than the more Byzantine type of the seated King, the Ruler and Judge. Both types have their place in Christian art.

MANY people look for a sudden manifestation of the power and wisdom of Christ in the King, in some form of grandeur, like the statue on Monte Corcovado. But the times seem to indicate that the coming of His rule in earthly matters will be through the gradual recognition by mankind, in the school of stubborn facts and hard experience, that only the teachings of Christ can save the world from disruption. The reign of Christ

the King must be won by the collaboration of millions of His followers, toiling long against heavy odds, profiting by retreats and laborious studies, strengthened by the Bread of Life and united in the bond of prayer.

The London *Tablet* for September 5 called attention to the actual success that Catholics enjoy at the present time in putting into practice the teachings of Christ as applied to public affairs. A glance over the different countries of Europe shows that wherever Catholics have been called upon as statesmen it is in the interests of practical efficiency, to save their countries from the financial and administrative disorder into which disruptive, frequently Masonic, elements have brought them.

Portugal, for instance, after a long series of revolutions and Cabinet collapses, is able to enjoy some degree of order and prosperity under the Carmona regime. This, notes the *Tablet*, "openly respects the Faith of the Portuguese; and the face of the land is changed. The budget balances, with a surplus, and the escudo is stabilized."

The practicality and sanity of Switzerland's former president, M. Musy, an exemplary Catholic, is described in this same issue of *AMERICA*. Austria was saved when she placed her destinies in the hands of Msgr. Seipel, and still cannot leave him out of consideration. In Austria, in Czechoslovakia, and in many other European countries, it is the Catholic elements which stand for economy combined with progress, the only combination that gets anywhere. "Belgium's wonderful recovery," notes the *Tablet*, "has been largely the work of a parliamentary party which frankly names itself Catholic." Holland's Prime Minister is a Catholic, and many of her leaders.

Notes the *Tablet*:

The two States where Governments have been least unstable are the Irish Free State and Hungary; and in both those countries, Catholics and their creed are held in high honor. . . . Not long ago, Switzerland had a Catholic President. At a time of tense anxiety in Jugoslavia the King made a Catholic priest [M. Koroshets] Prime Minister. . . . Belgium's wonderful recovery has been largely the work of a parliamentary party which frankly names itself Catholic.

Chile has recently, by the election of Dr. Montero, placed her hope of stability in the hands of a practical Catholic. Germany's sole bulwark against disorder and collapse, and with Germany that of the rest of the world, is her Catholic Chancellor, Dr. Bruening. Italy, with all her Fascist theorizing, frankly looks to a generation educated in Catholic teaching as the basis of the future happiness and prosperity of her people.

Speaking before the international congress of Catholic workingmen, which took place at Utrecht, in Holland, September 4 to 6 of this year, the German Catholic Deputy Herr Joos, himself a powerful factor for stability in the Reich, remarked: "The Encyclical of Pius XI has put an end to the speculations as to the sort of social order that Catholics should look to. Neither Liberalism nor Socialism, social Catholicism has its own banner." While warning against losing too much time in conventions, he urged the value of such congresses, particularly relating to Catholic social doctrine, as a means of over-

coming the discouragement sown by propagators of disorder.

WHERE Catholics have ranged themselves not on the side of progress, but have adopted ultra-conservative positions, the blame, according to Dr. John A. Ryan, in his latest book, "Questions of the Day" (page 255) is to be placed on the assaults on religion engineered by forces masked under the fair name of liberalism.

This mistaken and utterly unnecessary course is mainly responsible for the ultra-conservative position taken by many prominent Catholics, lay and clerical, on the Continent of Europe. To protect their religious interests they were compelled to ally themselves with economic and political reactionaries. Should a similar alignment take place in our own beloved country, the blame will surely rest upon those liberals who will not concede to Catholics the right to profess and practice in their own way the religious loyalties which they cherish above everything else in life.

Niceto Alcalá Zamora, the retiring President of Spain, in his public statement of October 15, branded as unworthy of the title of liberal those responsible for the present attack on religion in his country.

Spoke a Catholic Deputy in the French Chamber on March 23, 1904:

Believe me, gentlemen, after this war that you are making on God, France will be endangered, but you will not destroy the Church. She will simply transform herself. Other harbors will be opened to the Bark of Peter, which, in the course of ages, has seen the foundering of so many a gallant squadron. France, condemned to a lasting and profound inferiority, will let her ancient privileges slip into stronger and more skilful hands. She alone will suffer; for, gentlemen, in this duel that demagogic essays against God, God has nothing to fear.

Unless better counsels prevail for Spain, as they have in part prevailed in France, bitter experience may prove to the Spanish destructionists the truth of those words as applied to their own country.

THE death of Msgr. Nolens, former leader of the Catholic party in the Netherlands, "was a great loss to the Netherlands and his place will not be easily filled," wrote Richard M. Tobin, former United States Minister to the Netherlands, in the San Francisco *Monitor* for September 12 of this year. "It is a loss, too, to the cause of true liberalism and political enlightenment throughout the world. His memory will remain, an inspiring monument of love and service of God, his fellow man and his country."

It was Msgr. Nolens' work in establishing just living conditions for the workingmen of his own country that Mr. Tobin singles out as his outstanding service, the basis of his statesmanship. Under his supervision, the Government undertook the administration of the coal mines of Limburg, with a yearly output of nearly six million metric tons. Writes Mr. Tobin:

In the company of Msgr. Nolens, I inspected the operation of this great government industry. The conditions, industrial and social, are in an admirable state of perfection. The operation of the mines, the lives, and habits, and social conditions of the miners, their families and dependents, are all of a condition that can only be described as Utopian. It is a realization of the dreams of William Morris and John Ruskin.

What this learned, but simple and loveable man did for his own people is not only a refutation of the insinuations of materialistic liberals, such as Louis Fischer in the *Nation* for October 14, that planned production can only be established on Communistic lines. It is a practical demonstration of how to make the ideal pictured by Mr. Raul's statue a reality.

THE PILGRIM.

JEREMY.

Lucy said to Jeremy, "Jeremy!"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "What?"
 "Don't you remember what day today is?
 Surely you've not forgot?
 Didn't you notice the special pudding,
 And the little blue vase of flowers?
 Whose anniversary is it, Jeremy?"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "Ours."

 Lucy said to Jeremy, "Jeremy!"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "What?"
 "I've been waiting till I've been silly,
 Keeping your supper hot.
 All day long I've been so excited!
 Didn't you like your tea?
 How many years are we married, Jeremy?"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "Three."

 Lucy said to Jeremy, "Jeremy!"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "What?"
 "You seem dreadfully unromantic;
 Maybe we fuss a lot,
 But aren't we still the same old lovers,
 Summer and winter through?
 Tell me who was your sweetheart, Jeremy?"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "You."

 Lucy said to Jeremy, "Jeremy!"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "What?"
 "Remember the first year we were married,
 Out in the garden plot?
 The moon was lovely and you said I had
 Something as blue as skies.
 What did I have so pretty, Jeremy?"
 Jeremy said to Lucy: "Eyes."

 Lucy said to Jeremy, "Jeremy!"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "What?"
 "Remember the winter we went to dances?
 Remember the gown I bought?
 We danced one night at the Grand Pavilion,
 And you wore an evening suit;
 And how did you say your wife looked, Jeremy?"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "Cute."

 Lucy said to Jeremy, "Jeremy!"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "What?"
 "Remember the time when we had birthdays,
 And wasn't it nice you thought
 To buy me bows for my satin slippers,
 Because I had tiny feet!
 And what did you have to call them, Jeremy?"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "Sweet."

 Lucy said to Jeremy, "Jeremy!"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "What?"
 "Remember the poems we read together:—
 The Maiden of Camelot,
 And the Knight who lived in a wondrous castle,
 Holding her hand in his?
 Didn't they used to thrill us, Jeremy?"
 Jeremy said to Lucy, "Zzzzz!"

LEONARD FEENEY, S.J.

Dramatics

The Autumn Stage

ELIZABETH JORDAN

NEW YORK'S autumn theatrical season begins with the first offering of the Theater Guild. Strictly speaking, therefore, it has not yet begun at all, for the first play it presented was so complete a debacle that by common consent it does not count.

"He," by Alfred Savior, is a play which perhaps only a Frenchman would write and which probably only the loyal band of subscribers to the Theater Guild attractions would sit through. Even these are not "sitting pretty" or patiently or in large numbers. The night I saw the play the Guild Theater was not half filled. I was late in getting around to this production, and after the first five minutes I ardently wished I had not got around at all. It has pleased the author to make his hero a maniac who thinks he is God. We know that insane asylums hold many unfortunates with this delusion; but there the attendants are paid to be near them and to listen to their mouthings. Spectators who see "He" must pay for the privilege; and they richly deserve the evening of shock and spiritual nausea and intolerable boredom they are given for their money. This is all I have to say about "He," except that its production has given the Theater Guild much to live down.

It is especially fortunate for the directors, therefore, that their young associates, who call themselves the Group Theater, were moved last summer to dig into the Guild archives and unearth a play that had lain neglected for two years. The directors had bought this play, "The House of Connelly," by Paul Green (author of "In Abraham's Bosom") and had then apparently forgotten the purchase. When their young associates begged the privilege of experimenting with the piece at Brookfield Center during the past summer, the directors good humoredly nodded—and are now thanking their Maker for that nod. "The House of Connelly" has saved their autumn season. To a degree it has also "saved their faces"; and after "He" they were in desperate need of such salvation.

The success of "The House of Connelly" reads like a fairy tale. Rehearsed for weeks at Brookfield Center in its series of summer performances, it swung into New York this month with an effectiveness that called out all the theatrical band wagons and made critics weep with joy. Not since "Green Pastures" have such encomiums been bestowed on a new offering. Reviewers and public alike were losing hope of seeing anything good on our stage. When the despair was blackest the little band of amateurs quietly and modestly presented their play, and were clasped to Gotham's happy heart. Joy ran along the Rialto like an epidemic. Producers learned again the good old lesson that however hard the times the playgoers always have enough for anything really worth seeing. The Theater Guild, which had watched the Brookfield Center experiment with indulgent patience but with a certain remoteness, loudly adopted the gifted orphan as

its child. Playgoers are packing the Martin Beck Theater at every performance. Frederick Tone and Miss Margaret Barker, who have the leading roles in the new piece, have definitely "arrived." So has everybody else connected with the production, especially Morris Carnovsky, in the role of a decayed Southern gentleman.

All this excitement is about a quiet Southern play, done at a tempo so slow that it occasionally gets on the nerves of its audiences but that offers what is by far the most sincere and the most inspired work of the new season. Much has been said by the reviewers about its beauty and its poetry. Its beauty is the beauty of good work. Its poetry I myself do not quite see. Its theme is sordid: the degeneration of a fine old Southern family now penniless and living on its memories of former glory while its Negroes starve in the unworked fields of the plantation. The last of the line, young Will Connelly, is a weakling of whom the audience takes the blackest view from start to finish, as well it may. He gives his time to hunting and indiscriminate love making. He raves over his misfortunes but makes no effort to conquer them. His one decent action is negative. He refuses to marry an heiress for her money. In the end he marries a "poor-white" girl who is supposed to have enough pluck and energy to make a man of him. The audience is sorry for her—realizing the extent of the job she has undertaken. But before he marries, Will Connelly has broken his mother's heart, driven his sisters from home, arraigned his old reprobate of an uncle till the latter goes forth and kills himself. If this is "poetry" give me prose. But he is a vital, living creature, worth saving as all human creatures are, and one knows that work and his wife will save him if human power can do so. Meantime he and his story are always arresting and at moments deeply exciting.

Much is said during the play, largely by young Connelly himself, of the indiscriminate association of blacks and whites on the plantation, of which he has had his full share, and of the amount of Connelly blood that flows in black veins. More poetry? I think not. But the play's truth and sincerity cannot be questioned. Its lesson is sound; and its direction and acting are the best we have seen on our stage for many a day. These are the reasons for the clashing of cymbals over its success. New York is very sentimental. It loves to see young things win out. And young things have certainly won out with a rush in "The House of Connelly."

Further first aid to the distraught Guild Theater is offered by another connection with loyalty in its bones. Lawrence Langner, one of the Guild directors, was moved to organize the New York Repertory Company at this crisis, and to revive a number of old-time favorites.

Which suggests a digression.

Years ago, when I was editor of *Harper's Bazaar*, a young girl in my department came to me for advice.

"My conversation today," she began primly, "will range from grave to gay. My aunt's dead."

When I had expressed fitting sympathy, she added with the utmost buoyancy, "Now, tell me what to wear at the funeral!"

This long-forgotten incident recurred to me the other night when I looked over the list of Mr. Langner's offerings. They certainly range from grave to gay. On that occasion I was seeing his revival of Dion Boucicault's "The Streets of New York," originally produced at Wallack's Theater in 1857. Our grandfathers and grandmothers saw it there and wept. Today the motto of its audiences is, "Let us be gay," as they roar over the pathos. It is hard to realize the respectful seriousness with which the playgoers of sixty and seventy years ago took this old melodrama. There is one scene, the most poignant, in which three members of the great but suddenly penniless Fairweather family—mother, daughter, and son—are all out on the street late at night begging, while a furious snow storm rages around them. Each is within ten feet of the other two, and all are wholly unconscious of any other presence. The gayety of the audience, unrestrained from the rise of the curtain, reaches its height when the mother is unable to pawn her wedding ring to feed her children because the pawnbroker suspects that she has stolen it!

There has been nothing funnier in New York than the sob scene in "The Streets of New York," and the fine company Mr. Langner has brought together, including such artists as Dorothy Gish, Rollo Peters, Moffat Johnson, Sam Wren, and Jessiss Busley, play it as seriously as their predecessors in the roles played them in '57. An especially high note of the production is the singing and dancing of Mr. Wren as "Captain Jinks of the Horse Marines." It gives us one of the best five minutes in current offerings. Now, by way of being grave, Mr. Langner is presenting Ibsen's "Pillars of Society," produced by Winifred Lenihan and aided by other young members of the Theater Guild band in the cast, with "As You Like It" to follow. But the old melodrama is by far the most appealing offering of the new company, and venerable pairs of New Yorkers who wept over it in their early youth chuckle delightedly during the 1931 performances.

As if the spectacular record of "Connelly" had broken the evil spell that lay over our theaters this autumn, two more successful productions, both English, are added to the season's score. One is "Payment Deferred," a London success brought over by Gilbert Miller, with several members of its original cast, in the hope that it would thrill the Americans as it did the British. It is realizing those hopes. It is a new treatment of the old murder theme, a treatment in which the murder is important only in its subsequent effect on the lives of those concerned in it—the murderer and his family. The finish is as unexpected as it is thrilling and logical. Incidentally, another fine artist is made happy; for Charles Loughlin's American repetition of his London hit in the leading role is another of the dramatic high lights of the month. "Payment Deferred," produced at the Lyceum Theater, offers one an evening of gruesomeness, of horror, of thrills, and (an unusual addition in murder plays) of actual cerebral activity at the theater.

The second English success is "The Good Companions," Lee Shubert's presentation of Julian Wylie's production

at the Forty-fourth Street Theater. Most of us have read the novel by J. B. Priestley, from which the play is adapted by Edward Knoblock. Most of us have wondered how a compact play could possibly be successfully made of such a readable but discursive and wandering tale. It is made by the simple process of putting the action into two parts and sixteen scenes.

Thus we see the characters starting forth from their homes in search of adventure, as we did in the book; we see them meeting and converging at various points till their lives become interwoven. Because some of them are theatrical people—"barnstormers" doing small towns on the road—we have a lot of incidental music, dancing, and unique characterization. One or two of the critics have been disturbed by the abundance of pep and go in the production. These things did not disturb me. There would be just that much pep and go in that particular crowd. We see a county fair finishing in a fight; we see a theatrical performance broken up by hoodlums and ending with the theater on fire; we see a lot of hard work and ambition and ability and lack of ability. In short we see something that is very much like life itself among the characters represented.

There are those who do not care for "The Good Companions." Two of them sat next to me the other night and moaned at intervals throughout the performance. But ninety per cent of the audience, in which number I include myself (making it a hundred per cent, shall we say?) liked the play very much.

There are naturally a few British touches that surprise American eyes. For example, we are told at the finish that one of the leading characters is going to Canada to live. We accept the statement. We are then shown a mighty ship, filling the entire stage and with every port-hole brilliantly illuminated, to which our hero is making his solitary way up a deserted gang plank. Evidently no one else is going to Canada that night. There isn't even a loiterer on the wharf. It all seems very sad and lonely. But I am assured that it is merely a beautiful tableau to send us away happy. So that's that.

I must not forget to mention the excellent if exuberant acting of the entire company and especially that of Valerie Taylor as Miss Trout, George Carney (the man who went to Canada) as Jess Oakroyd, Vera Lennox as Susie Dean, and Hugh Sinclair as Inigo. The names of these four players are printed in big type on the programs. They deserve the distinction.

REVIEWS

Questions of the Day. By JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D., LITT. D. Boston: The Stratford Company. \$3.00.

The title of this book is apt. Dr. Ryan, in twenty-three papers, republished from thirteen periodicals, treats not only of "questions of the day," but of *the* questions of the day, the burning points of controversy in the United States during the last three years. They fall into four groups: Prohibition; Catholics and politics, which places before us in permanent form the controversial papers that centered the attention of the entire nation in 1927 and 1928; economic questions, in which Dr. Ryan passes in sharp review the doctrine of public-utility valuation that he sees as an ethical menace, a carte blanche for camouflaged usury; also

the problem of unemployment and poverty; and, finally, miscellaneous questions, including his valuable discussion of birth control and sterilization. Dr. Ryan is probably best known to all of us as the untiring defender of the workingman's right to organize, as stated by the authoritative teaching of the Church. "No amount of employer benevolence, no diffusion of a sympathetic attitude on the part of the public, no increase of beneficial organization can adequately supply the lack of organization among the workers themselves." He is known as the economic analyst; the practical moral theologian; the temperate yet forthright controversialist. These papers illustrate all these John A. Ryan traditions. They illustrate the width of his interest, and the concrete, exact knowledge that he can bring to bear on such a variety of subjects. But they reveal, furthermore, a quality in Dr. Ryan's language which makes him speak to convince, not merely to illuminate. This secret Dr. Ryan betrayed recently when he declared that justice can only be effected through charity. It is the note of intense charity, a glowing love not for abstractions, but for the ordinary human beings that he has met with in the daily path of life, that gives to Dr. Ryan's arguments a character all their own. Not speculation but profound concern prompted him to these discussions. Those who feel a like concern for the critical period through which we are now passing cannot lay these essays down without spiritual, as well as intellectual betterment. J. L. F.

History of the Popes. By FERNAND HAYWARD. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. \$5.00.

Here is a book excellent in purpose and design but somewhat faulty in details. It cannot be read hurriedly, nor can it be used as a reference book without due caution and care. Exact dates—day, month, year—are given for certain events which do not agree with the equivalent dates given in the standard works of reference. For example, the crowning and anointing of the Emperors Lothar II, and Frederick I, as given by Hayward are certainly inaccurate. These inaccuracies make the attentive reader hesitate in accepting any of the dates—and they occur very frequently in every chapter—assigned to important events. Confidence too is unsettled by statements set down as undisputed convictions, whereas they are only private opinions, sometimes highly disputable, and often clearly explainable by proper exposition. The statement (page 309) that Alexander VII "condemned certain Jesuit principles of casuistry which seemed to him to savor of laxity," and the still blunter one (page 312) that Innocent XI "condemned the casuistry of the Jesuits," call for, at least, a footnote which would distinguish between an individual member of the Society who may have held such opinions, and the acknowledged system of morality embraced and defended by the Jesuits in common with the dogmatic teaching of the Universal Church. In plan and intent M. Hayward's "History of the Popes" is instructive and absorbing. Some of the blemishes in it may be due to faulty translation—the original is in French. The difficulty of compressing into a volume of 400 pages the history of the most unique institution in the world, an institution that has endured for almost two thousand years, is in itself a gigantic task. The substantial accuracy of the work in its bold outlines, and the undoubted sincerity of the author in his devotion to the Church, incline the reader to mildness in criticism. There is a gracious introduction by Abbot Butler, a "List of the Popes," and an alphabetical Index. M. J. S.

Mind and Matter. By G. F. STOUT. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$3.75.

There have been many times since college days when we have thanked God for the soundness and lucidity of Scholastic philosophy. At no time has that been more true than during the golden hours of reading, as we followed some modern philosopher in his sincere attempt to handle a purely philosophical problem in the modern philosophical way. And such was our experience as we passed from page to page of this first volume based on the Gifford Lectures, delivered in the University of Edinburgh, in 1919 and 1921. The author, a professor of logic and metaphysics

in the University of St. Andrews, begins his treatment of the relation of mind and matter by positing the necessity of common sense as a sort of ultimate criterion of all philosophical and scientific experience, a rather extreme view, admirably handled by Jacques Maritain, in his "Introduction to Philosophy." He is concerned with the causal, teleological and esthetic aspects of nature because he believes they evidence the presence of mind and manifest a correlate of our own mental processes. He delves into the more subtle and abstruse question of the relation of body and mind by a consideration of the scientific theories of Interactionism, Parallelism, and Materialism, subjecting the last mentioned to a searching analysis and a thorough and convincing refutation. Then he proceeds to give us a very scholarly presentation of the different theories of knowledge, stressing Kant particularly, with whom he agrees in what he is pleased to call the main drift of his theory, but from whom he departs in Kant's distinction between the empirical and the transcendental self as well as in his "a priori" synthesis. He summarizes his complete work by maintaining that mind must be fundamental in the universe of being and not derivative from anything that is not mind; that investigation proves the necessity of positing one universal and eternal mind developing and expressing itself in the world of finite and changeable beings which we call nature; that this one universal and eternal mind must be ascribed to nature itself, a contention he holds to be untenable, or it must be attributed to a Being beyond nature and distinct from nature who gives to it, through and through, a character that is otherwise inexplicable. The consideration of this latter phase he promises in a subsequent volume which we await with interest and anticipated pleasure. The book before us is attractive in its arrangement, logical in its development, fair in its treatment, but we note with a feeling of surprise a complete absence of knowledge of or reference to St. Thomas. In seeking philosophical dignity among the least, the author apparently has abdicated it among the greatest.

J. A. L.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Footprints of Sanctity.—Following chronologically the months of the year, the third volume of the revised edition of the Rev. Alban Butler's "The Lives of the Saints" (Kenedy, \$2.75), edited by the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., and Norah Leeson, is devoted to March festivals. More extensively here than in the other two volumes has Dr. Butler's compilation been supplemented, for since his day the Roman martyrology has come to include in March the North American Martyrs, Father John Ogilvie, beatified in 1929, the Redemptorist St. Clement Mary Hofbauer, and others. It is noteworthy that the March Saints, as the preface to the volume points out, are in a peculiar degree representative of national or class sentiment. Thus there is St. David, the patron of the Welsh; St. Casimir, patron of Poland; St. Patrick, patron of the Irish; and St. Gregory the Great, the "Apostle of the English." In addition we have St. Joseph, the patron of the Universal Church; St. Thomas Aquinas, patron of scholastic studies; St. John of God, "patron of all hospitals and sick folk." The volume manifests the same careful criticism that characterized its predecessors, and the editors indicate the sources of their material and give ample references for further private studies. Because of the number of new Saints and Blessed included in the revision, some of Butler's homilies have been omitted, though the editors advise that there is no intention of dispensing with them in future volumes.

In ecclesiastical language the term *Doctor* has a distinctively technical meaning. It is reserved for that small body of churchmen whose learning and sanctity have merited that the title be authoritatively bestowed upon them by the Church. In all twenty-six Doctors are recognized, and in "The Doctors of the Church" (Benziger, \$2.45), the Rev. Father Paul, O.S.F.C., sketches the story of each. The biographies are brief, but adequate, and are mainly concerned with the statements of the salient facts in the career of the subjects, and an indication of their contribution to

ecclesiastical learning, with little or no moralizing and only occasional inspirational passages. In an appendix, sketches are added of some of the Fathers of the Church who have not been declared Doctors. It is generally accepted that four things constitute a "Father": antiquity, orthodoxy, sanctity, and the approval of the Church.

A Book for Boys.—One need not read far along in "The Altar Boys of St. John's" (Kenedy, \$1.50) by the Rev. Martin J. Scott, S.J., before he becomes aware that "Father Boone," who drills St. John's Altar Boys into becoming West Pointers of the sanctuary, and the author have many similar characteristics. For Father Martin Scott has had charge of Sanctuary Societies in New York and other cities. He knows this particularly attractive species of the *genus puer* inside out and his years of experience have taught him that the judicious use of rewards, other than holy pictures and scapular medals, go a long way towards building us that—the quotation is from the book—"wonderful quality, the *esprit de corps*, which makes for success in any organization, and without which everything else is useless." How this *esprit de corps* is engendered, is the plot of this story. Of course, altar boys will devour Father Scott's latest contribution to Sanctuary Society literature. But those in every parish, who have the perplexing problem of handling altar boys and are anxious to bring their cassocked charges up to sanctuary perfection will thank the author for the wealth of hints he scatters with lavish hand. This book is that happy combination—an excellent boys' book and a valuable course of instruction for Directors of Sanctuary Societies.

Books Received.—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

AS THE GENTLE RAIN. By Isabel C. Clarke. \$2.50. Longmans, Green.
 BEHIND THE SCENES WITH OURSELVES. By Carl Ramus. \$3.00. Century.
 CASTLE SKULL. By John Dickson Carr. \$2.00. Harper.
 CHARLES OF EUROPE. By D. B. Wyndham Lewis. \$5.00. Coward-McCann.
 CHURCH AND THE GOSPELS, THE. By Joseph Huby. \$2.00. Holt.
 CLOSE TO JESUS. Compiled by Father Aloysius, O.M.Cap. 1/6. Gill.
 CONVERSATION WITH A CAT, A. By Hilaire Belloc. \$2.50. Harper.
 CRANMER. By Hilaire Belloc. \$5.00. Lippincott.
 DIFFERENT STATES OF MAN, THE. By Rev. F. J. Remler. 5c. I.C.T.S.
 DRILL EXERCISES IN FRENCH. By Sister Benita Daley. 40c. Published by the author.
 DRY AMERICA. By Atticus Webb. 50c. Cokesbury Press.
 EFFECT OF FAMILIARITY ON MAZE PERFORMANCE OF ALBINO RATS, THE. By George W. Haney. 25c. University of California Press.
 ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, THE. Vol. V. Edited by Edwin R. A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson. \$7.50. Macmillan.
 EPIC OF AMERICA, THE. By James Truslow Adams. \$3.00. Little, Brown.
 EPISTLES OF THE SUNDAYS AND FESTIVALS, THE. Vols. I and II. By Rev. Cornelius J. Ryan, D.D. \$9.00. Gill.
 EVERY MAN'S BIBLE. An Anthology. Arranged by W. R. Inge. \$3.00. Longmans, Green.
 GEOLOGICAL AGES HOAX, THE. By George Macready Price. \$1.25. Revell.
 GRAFT IN BUSINESS. By John T. Flynn. \$3.00. Vanguard Press.
 HEROES OF CIVILIZATION. By Joseph Cotter and Haym Jaffe. Junior Literary Guild.
 IN MY END IS MY BEGINNING. By Maurice Baring. \$3.75. Knopf.
 JADWIGA, POLAND'S GREAT QUEEN. By Charlotte Kellogg. \$2.50. Macmillan.
 JUST TO REMIND YOU. By Owen Davis. \$2.00. Farrar and Rinehart.
 KING ALBERT IN THE WAR. By Lieutenant-General Galet. \$6.00. Houghton, Mifflin.
 LARRY. THOUGHTS OF YOUTH. \$1.25. John Day.
 LEGENDS AND ROMANCES OF SPAIN. By Lewis Spence. \$5.00. Farrar and Rinehart.
 LIFE OF ANTON BRUCKNER, THE. By Gabriel Engel. Roerich Museum Press.
 LITIGIOUS LAW. By Rev. P. Charles Augustine, O.S.B., D.D. \$4.50. Herder.
 LIVING VOICE, THE. By Agnes M. Blundell. \$2.00. Benziger.
 NATURAL AND THE SUPERNATURAL, THE. By John W. Oman. \$3.00. Macmillan.
 NATURE OF BELIEF, THE. By Rev. M. C. D'Arcy. \$3.00. Longmans, Green.
 NEGRO YEAR BOOK, 1931-1932. Edited by Monroe N. Work. \$2.00. Negro Year Book Publishing Co.
 ONE NIGHT IN SANTA ANNA. By Thomas Washington Metcalfe. \$2.00. Macmillan.
 OUR LAWLESS POLICE. By Ernest Jerome Hopkins. \$3.00. Viking.
 PASSING THROUGH GERMANY, 1931. Terramare Office, Berlin.
 PHANTOM FINGERS. By J. Jefferson Farjeon. \$2.00. Dial Press.
 PORTRAIT OF AN AMERICAN. By Robert P. Tristram Coffin. \$2.00. Macmillan.
 PROSE AND POETRY FOR PRECIS WRITING. Selected and edited by Irene Hill FitzGerald and Robert H. Maloney. Catholic Education Press.
 PSYCHOLOGY: SCIENCE OR SUPERSTITION? By Grace Adams. \$2.50. Covici-Friede.
 SAINT IN THE MAKING, A. By John Oxenham. \$2.00. Longmans, Green.
 SAINT PATRICK. By Mrs. Thomas Concannon. \$2.50. Longmans, Green.
 THESE AGITATORS AND THEIR IDEA. By Harry Malcolm Chalfant. \$2.00. Cokesbury Press.
 WAVES, THE. By Virginia Woolf. \$2.50. Harcourt, Brace.
 WE ACTOR FOLKS. By Mary Asquith. \$2.00. White Squaw Press.
 WIVES AND MOTHERS. By Jean Rudd. \$2.00. Century.

The Wild Orchid. American Beauty. The Forest Ship. The Kinsmen Know How to Die. Basque People.

Sigrid Undset plots her latest novel, "The Wild Orchid" (Knopf. \$2.50), in modern Norway, in Christiania and Trondhjem. She counts this as the first of a two-volume work, this dealing with earthly love and the next book with a supernatural sequence. Mrs. Undset is best in her male characters; and a boy growing into maturity is the central figure in "The Wild Orchid." Paul's mother is a free-thinking doctrinaire who has tried to educate her children according to her opinions; she has divorced her husband amiably, and he is amiably married. Paul succumbs to a love affair with a spineless white creature who shows more strength and understanding than he does in the end. He then marries, but not too happily. Part of the theme and some passages are of the flesh. But the significance of the book is its powerful Catholic teaching. Paul is attracted to Catholicism and associates with Catholics who are most attractive. Mrs. Undset seems almost inspired in her presentation of Catholic belief and practice. "The Wild Orchid" is an intensely interesting narrative and a magnificent argument for Catholicism.

The turn of the circle in Connecticut is Edna Ferber's theme in "American Beauty" (Doubleday, Doran. \$2.50). The time in the first chapter is 1930, with Candace and her father, True Baldwin, returning to his boyhood home on the farm. It then leaps back to the first settlers, the Oakes and Champions, in 1700. From then it skips to their descendants in 1890, and ends with 1930. It is a study of the degeneration of the pioneer English-settler stock, and the new vigorous blood infused by the Polish immigrant which also tends to decadence. The plot is loose, but there is no need for it to be stronger. The pictures of the three periods are the vital aspects of the story, and the types of character, and the conflicting races and strains in the races. There is artistry and sincerity in every chapter of the book.

Out of Germany comes "The Forest Ship" (Viking Press. \$2.50) by Arnold Hollriegel, a tale burning brightly with the fever of the jungle based upon the exciting adventures of the haughty Spanish knight Don Francisco de Orellana. The story resolves itself into a sharp contrast of the mighty Amazon at a time when the Incas held sway and the river as it flows today, little changed by the civilizations lining its sinister banks. The main theme of the story rests upon Hollriegel's conviction that true happiness can never be attained in this life. It was on that account that the mighty Orellana and his followers perished seeking new goals. And in this modern age a Don Quixote-like schoolmaster seeks to find his El Dorado by following in the footsteps of the Spanish conquerors, only to find that he, too, can never be satisfied. *Necesse est navigare* becomes the watchword of the story. The sinister blendings of illusion and reality running throughout Hollriegel's portrayal, add a touch that is unique.

In the novel, "The Kinsmen Know How to Die" (Morrow. \$3.00), Sophie Bocharsky and Florida Pier give us the personal record of a young Russian girl who served as a Red Cross nurse on the Russian front, until the revolution in Petrograd demoralized the army. The book is interesting and informative. While the picture which she paints is, of course, dark, nevertheless there is much shading with gray and here and there a daub of real white. Moreover there is in the book a complete absence of that reveling in horror which has made so many books of this type utterly disgusting; rather the narrative displays throughout a distinctive refinement of outlook and treatment.

In "Basque People," (Harcourt Brace. \$2.00), Dorothy Canfield gives us a collection of short stories, most of them true, concerning the lives and traditions of that unique race. Living on the border between France and Spain, and physically belonging to both, these people acknowledge allegiance to neither. That such a race, with its quaint customs, should exist today, with all our modern laws and efficiency, is a thing to marvel at; and yet, when we see that people through Miss Canfield's eyes, we feel that we would like to live among them, for a time, at least, escaping all the artificiality necessary in our advanced era. "Basque People" is very well written, in an unusually quiet style.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

School Incidentally Again

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The editorial in the issue of AMERICA for October 17, "Atheism in the College," like the letters appearing in recent issues on the cost of parochial school education, are warning signals. The writer of the editorial, like those who contributed comment on the original letter, seems to miss the point that the real trouble lies in the mounting cost of Catholic Education—some of which with a proper appreciation of the burden under which Catholic parents labor might well be curtailed.

Let me illustrate: In several parishes in the diocese the girl graduates last June were obliged to purchase from the Sister a graduation dress at twelve dollars apiece. The girl graduates in the public schools made their own.

The pupils in public schools are not called upon for ten cents for this and twenty-five cents for that. Another expense is the collection of school money, explained by the pastor as only five cents a day but amounting, nevertheless, to one dollar per month, in addition to the envelope collection in the church every second Sunday.

I could go on indefinitely but will stop with one more example. Today my three children attending our parish school brought home a printed notice that starting in November all the children would be obliged to wear uniform clothes—for boys, white blouses, red ties, and blue pants; for girls, middy blouses and blue skirts. Why in the name of Heaven must any Religious superior pick out this particular time to burden further those of us who are trying so hard to get by on reduced salaries?

I cannot continue to meet these demands and certainly I cannot be expected to have my children pointed out as unable to pay like the others. I must join the army of those who have been obliged to send their children to the public school.

You will ask, what has all this to do with the editorial. Well, in my humble opinion, I think it applies to all our schools up to college. It's not the advertised tuition, but the incidentals which break the camel's back.

Brooklyn.

A FATHER.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mr. Andrew Squires, of New York, had a letter in the issue of AMERICA for October 3 in which he disapproved of collections taken up in Catholic schools. Many Catholics will thank him for that letter.

Well-to-do parents can afford to comply with the solicitations of their children, but there are many who can barely make ends meet. Hence they must refuse, their children feel humiliated, and school becomes a torture for them.

Pastors should see to it that these collections cease. The burden of supporting Catholic schools is already heavy; why make it still heavier?

Denton, Tex.

RAYMOND VERNIMONT.

Information Wanted

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I would be grateful, and her brother would be still more grateful, if you would allow us to use your columns to ask for the whereabouts of one Margaret Wilhelm, born in Munich, Germany, in 1870, who joined some order of Sisters in Philadelphia during the years between 1892-93 or thereabouts.

Her brother, who has been separated from her since early childhood, wishes above all to have news of her and if possible communication with her. *Nunc adesperascit.*

St. Louis.

RUSSELL WILBUR.

[Answers to this inquiry should be sent to AMERICA.—Ed. AMERICA.]